

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 9, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

Reverend Tim Storey, Tim Storey Ministries, Whittier, CA, offered the following prayer:

Father, we thank You for the opportunity to serve You in this great country, for Your Word says trust in the Lord with all your heart and lean not on your own understanding, but in all your ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct your path.

Father, we believe that there is a difference between good ideas and God ideas. We pray that today You would give us wisdom to walk in Your God ideas, and not just our own good ideas.

Father, we thank You that You are an awesome God, One that is watching us, protecting us, guiding us, guarding us, and governing us.

Father, let us trust in You today with all our heart and lean not on our own understanding, but in all our ways acknowledging You, and You shall direct our path.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 144, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—256

Abercrombie	Barca	Bevill
Ackerman	Barcia	Bilbray
Andrews (ME)	Barlow	Blackwell
Andrews (NJ)	Barrett (WI)	Bonior
Andrews (TX)	Barton	Borski
Applegate	Bateman	Boucher
Archer	Becerra	Brewster
Bacchus (FL)	Bellenson	Brooks
Baesler	Berman	Browder

Brown (FL)	Holden	Parker	Bonilla	Hoke	Quillen
Brown (OH)	Houghton	Pastor	Bunning	Horn	Quinn
Bryant	Hoyer	Payne (VA)	Burton	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Byrne	Hughes	Pelosi	Buyer	Hyde	Ravenel
Cantwell	Hutto	Penny	Callahan	Inhofe	Regula
Cardin	Inglis	Peterson (FL)	Calvert	Istook	Ridge
Carr	Inslee	Peterson (MN)	Camp	Jacobs	Roberts
Chapman	Jefferson	Pickett	Canady	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Pickle	Coble	Kim	Rohrabacher
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Pombo	Cox	King	Ros-Lehtinen
Clinger	Johnston	Pomeroy	Crane	Klug	Roukema
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Poshard	Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Royce
Coleman	Kaptur	Price (NC)	Dickey	Kolbe	Saxton
Collins (IL)	Kasich	Reed	Doolittle	Kyl	Schaefer
Collins (MI)	Kennedy	Reynolds	Dornan	Lazio	Schiff
Combest	Kennelly	Richardson	Dreier	Leach	Schroeder
Condit	Kildee	Roemer	Duncan	Levy	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Kingston	Rose	Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Cooper	Kleczka	Rostenkowski	Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Shays
Coppersmith	Klein	Roth	Everett	Lightfoot	Shuster
Costello	Klink	Rothblat-Allard	Ewing	Linder	Skeen
Coyne	Kopetski	Rush	Fawell	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
Cramer	Kreidler	Sabo	Fields (TX)	McCandless	Smith (OR)
Crapo	LaFalce	Sanders	Fingerhut	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Danner	Lambert	Sangmeister	Fowler	McDade	Solomon
Darden	Lancaster	Santorum	Franks (CT)	McHugh	Stearns
De la Garza	Lantos	Sarpalius	Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Stump
Deal	LaRocco	Sawyer	Gallely	McMillan	Sundquist
DeLauro	Laughlin	Schenk	Gallo	Meyers	Talent
Dellums	Lehman	Schumer	Gekas	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Derrick	Levin	Scott	Gingrich	Michel	Taylor (NC)
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Serrano	Goodlatte	Molinar	Thomas (CA)
Dicks	Lipinski	Sharp	Goss	Moorhead	Torkildsen
Dingell	Lloyd	Shepherd	Grams	Morella	Upton
Dixon	Long	Sisisky	Grandy	Murphy	Vucanovich
Dooley	Lowey	Skaggs	Greenwood	Nussle	Walker
Durbin	Maloney	Skeltion	Hancock	Oxley	Walsh
Edwards (CA)	Mann	Slattery	Hansen	Packard	Weldon
Engel	Manton	Slaughter	Hastert	Paxon	Wolf
English (AZ)	Margolies-	Smith (NJ)	Hefley	Petri	Young (AK)
English (OK)	Mezvinsky	Snowe	Herger	Porter	Young (FL)
Eshoo	Markey	Spratt	Hobson	Portman	Zeliff
Evans	Martinez	Stark	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)	Zimmer
Fazio	Matsui	Stenholm			
Fields (LA)	Mazzoli	Stokes			
Filner	McCloskey	Strickland			
Fish	McCrery	Studds			
Flake	McCurdy	Stupak			
Foglietta	McHale	Swift			
Ford (TN)	McInnis	Synar			
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Tanner			
Frost	McNulty	Tauzin			
Furse	Meehan	Tejeda			
Gejdenson	Meek	Thornton			
Gephardt	Menendez	Thurman			
Geren	Mfume	Torres			
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Torricelli			
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Towns			
Gilman	Mineta	Traficant			
Glickman	Mink	Unsoeld			
Gonzalez	Moakley	Valentine			
Gordon	Mollohan	Velazquez			
Green	Montgomery	Vento			
Gunderson	Moran	Visclosky			
Gutierrez	Murtha	Volkmer			
Hall (OH)	Myers	Waters			
Hall (TX)	Nadler	Watt			
Hamburg	Natcher	Waxman			
Hamilton	Neal (MA)	Wheat			
Harman	Neal (NC)	Whitten			
Hastings	Oberstar	Williams			
Hayes	Obey	Wilson			
Hefner	Oliver	Wise			
Hilliard	Ortiz	Woolsey			
Hinchey	Orton	Wynn			
Hoagland	Owens	Yates			
Hochbrueckner	Pallone				

NAYS—144

Allard	Ballenger	Bilirakis
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Bachus (AL)	Bartlett	Blute
Baker (CA)	Bentley	Boehlert
Baker (LA)	Bereuter	Boehner

Bishop	Goodling	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Henry	Rangel
Castle	Huffington	Rowland
Clay	Hunter	Smith (IA)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Spence
Cunningham	Johnson (GA)	Swett
DeFazio	Livingston	Thomas (WY)
DeLay	Machtley	Thompson
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Tucker
Ford (MI)	Minge	Washington
Gilchrest	Payne (NJ)	Wyden

NOT VOTING—33

□ 1227

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, during floor proceedings today, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting of the House Export Task Force featuring Ambassadors Mickey Kantor and Carla Hills and missed Roll Call Vote No. 201 on the Speaker's approval of the Journal. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

Inasmuch as the discussion focused on the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], I believed it important to hear on behalf of my constituents

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

what the Ambassadors had to say about the importance of these trade agreements to economic growth in Connecticut, the United States, and throughout North America.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND TIM STOREY

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, we welcome and thank the Reverend Tim Storey of Whittier, CA. The work of Tim Storey Ministries and the Champions International is making a significant difference in the United States and, indeed, the world. Thank you, Reverend Storey, for offering the prayer of the day.

PARTY LOYALTY

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, as the Democrats decide how to best punish those who voted against history's largest tax increase, Republicans have decided to support and encourage those who oppose tax-and-spend policies. This is just one more example of the clear difference between many Democrats in this House and Republicans. We believe that when party loyalty supersedes loyalty to the American people as a whole, then party loyalty must be abandoned. That was clearly the case for those who opposed President Clinton's tax plan last week.

Eleven Democratic subcommittee chairmen voted against the President's tax increase, and now some of the more diehard taxers in the Democrat caucus want to punish those chairmen for not exhibiting enough loyalty to the Democratic Party. I have questions for those tax raisers. What about loyalty to the American taxpayer? Do they not deserve some loyalty, too? Do they not already pay enough taxes to a government that knows only how to spend?

Mr. Speaker, if these chairmen and others in the Democratic Party feel too much heat from the tax raisers, they should come to the Republican Party. We never oppose those who place loyalty to the American people above their party.

□ 1230

DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IS FREEST PARTY IN COUNTRY

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I take the well because, unfortunately though understandably, the gentleman from Alabama who has just left it is remarkably uninformed about the Democratic caucus and its policies, as well as about its attitudes toward its members and its responsibility to the country.

We have just left a Democratic caucus in which the overwhelming decision was to take no action against any member of the caucus, subcommittee chairmen or other, for any vote that he or she casts on the floor of the House. This action is a clear reflection of its belief that Members of this House on the Democratic side particularly are the agents of their constituents, of the people who sent them here, of the people who entrust to them the great responsibility and honor of representing them in their districts and in the Halls of this Chamber.

Twenty years ago, I had the opportunity as a member of the caucus to be instrumental in the removal from the caucus rules of the Democratic Party rule R7 which presumed to say that by a two-thirds vote the Democratic caucus could direct the vote of Members on the floor. I take pride in the fact that that antique provision was removed by overwhelming majority 20 years ago. From that time to this day no Democrat has ever been asked to vote on any matter before this House under threat of retribution, retaliation, or punishment. It remains true, however, that in many State legislatures, there is a daily caucus to decide how members are to vote on the floor. Every member who has served in a Republican legislature knows that. It is also true of Democrats in State legislatures.

The Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, however, is the freest party in this country in terms of voting one's conscience and judgment on matters of public concern. So let us end this false suggestion that Democrats are being asked to vote under threat of penalty or anything but their judgment and conscience in the service of their constituents.

We get a majority the old-fashioned way. We prevail upon the conscience and judgment of Members to vote for the legislation, and we do not punish those who have other opinions.

REALITY OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY POLITICS

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished Speaker for a cheerful and wonderful version of reality which has little resemblance to the truth as we know it here on the floor.

I would suggest to him that if we would bring back our good friend, Senator PHIL GRAMM, a former colleague, and have him come and visit and explain to us what it was like to have his committee position stripped from him, that he would be glad to talk. I would suggest to him that there are other former Democrats that we could bring in that would be glad to talk. But, of course, it is in the spirit of comity and last night's picnic to enjoy life, to say things in broad and baroque fashion.

For anyone who believes that no arms were twisted, no threats were made, it is an interesting fantasy, but one I fear does not resemble the brute reality of the House or the legislative process here. I would suggest that any Member or citizen who doubts me to call Senator PHIL GRAMM and ask him what it was like.

TIME FOR A REALITY CHECK

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, it is time for a reality check.

Critics on the other side of the aisle say they want something done about the deficit and yet every time the Clinton administration comes up with a new approach, they unite in blind, lockstep opposition.

The reality is that we have a new President who is trying very hard to come to grips with an enormous deficit he inherited from his predecessors.

He has offered a variety of approaches and has shown flexibility in meeting objections raised by members of his own party and by the opposition party. He has established a clear set of principles—we must reduce the deficit by \$500 billion over the next 5 years and we must do it in a way that does not harm the poor and that encourages investment in our future.

President Clinton has called for a mix of spending cuts and tax increases that achieve this goal. He has demonstrated that he is willing to listen to the critics of his specific approaches and to make accommodations that will increase the amount of spending cuts and make his program fairer to farmers and the middle class. All we hear from the other side of the aisle is blind, mindless opposition.

Madam Speaker, I am proud that we have a President who is working hard to devise a package of read deficit reduction. Let us all keep working with him. The country needs our help.

FREE THE BONIOR FOUR

(Mr. PAXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAXON. Madam Speaker, this is in response and discussion of the Speaker's comments.

On May 30, just after the House vote on the Clinton tax bill, the Associated Press carried this story:

By the time the vote was over, Bonior said there were four other unidentified lawmakers prepared to vote "yes" who were freed to vote "no" because they were not needed.

"Four in the hole, as we say," Bonior said.

My colleagues, American taxpayers deserve to know the truth about the majority whip's comments.

Which of the 38 Democrats who voted "no" were "in the hole", in the pocket of Mr. BONIOR, Majority Leader GEPHARDT, and Speaker FOLEY?

Which of the Democrats, who voted "no", were committed in secret to vote "yes"?

And, on the most important taxation vote ever, did those Democrats who committed in secret to vote "yes" then issue press releases extolling their independence and courage in opposing the very Clinton taxes they were pledged to support?

Until we know the names of the Bonior four, constituents of all 38 Democrats who voted "no" will wonder.

So, Republicans will keep pressing. Free the Bonior four.

RECONCILIATION

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, let us make it plain what happened 10 days ago. The Democrats had 38 Members who were willing to vote their districts whereas on the Republican side of the aisle they obviously did not have the freedom to vote their districts because they voted lockstep for continued gridlock.

Over the past couple of weeks, we have been working on the most important bill to come before this Congress this year. That bill is the Reconciliation Act of 1993. As a freshman and as a Representative of an energy State such as Texas the issue of the Btu tax has caused this to be one of the most difficult decisions I have made during my short time in Washington.

However, during these past few weeks, the President has made a great effort to answer some of my concerns with this bill. I am confident that my concerns have been heard by President Clinton and will be addressed during Senate deliberations. The administration has made a good faith effort to eliminate some of the effects of the

Btu tax and maybe the tax itself. With these changes in plan I will continue to support the President in his efforts to reduce the deficit and create a more equitable tax structure.

Let me mention some favorable items in the bill.

It reduces the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years.

It contains 200 specific cuts that result in \$189 billion in savings.

Seventy-five percent of all new taxes are paid by the wealthy.

People whose incomes are over \$100,000.

It helps small business by allowing a \$25,000 deduction for the purchase of new equipment.

It increases the earned income tax credit so a person who works 40 hours a week and has a child will not live in poverty.

It reinstates the targeted jobs tax credit which helps hard-to-employ persons get jobs.

It eliminates tax deductions for lobbyists.

The real estate market in Texas has continued to remain in a slump since the mid-1980's. The economic plan contains passive loss real estate provisions that will help our sagging real estate markets.

It increases funding for childhood immunization by \$2.1 billion.

It caps deductibility on executive compensation at \$1 million.

JOB CREATION AND BILL CLINTON

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Speaker, according to the latest Department of Labor statistics, the unemployment rate dropped to 6.9 percent last month. That is not great, but it is an improvement.

I urge President Bill Clinton and the Democratic majority to take steps to ensure that this recovery continues.

Don't do anything that will hurt this recovery. Let the private sector work for all Americans.

Don't levy the largest tax increase in history, and stifle future economic growth.

Don't pass more Government regulations and unfunded mandates which will slowly but surely strangle private enterprise and small business. Don't pass striker replacement legislation, which will replace job creation with strikes, and hurt our competitiveness.

Don't spend more money, which will only increase our national debt and spur inflation.

In other words, don't act on your Big Government agenda, which will stall our recovery and kill jobs. Don't kill our economic recovery.

□ 1240

CLOSE DOWN THE HIV PRISON CAMP

(Mrs. MEEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK. Madam Speaker, I applaud the decision of U.S. District Court Judge Sterling Johnson to order the release of more than 150 Haitians who are imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay. Their only crime is to be infected with AIDS. They deserve our compassion, but their reception was cold and callous. They sought freedom from persecution, but only found a prison.

Even a former commander of the camp expressed the view that these people, who include pregnant women and children, should be allowed to come to the United States. It is an absurd policy that forces us to expend considerable resources in keeping these people at Guantanamo.

I have written to President Clinton and to Attorney General Reno urging them not to appeal Judge Johnson's ruling. Many of these Haitians have relatives in the United States and they should be allowed to join their families.

Let us close down what Judge Johnson called the "HIV prison camp." It is a disgrace that we who pride ourselves on justice, compassion, and freedom should turn away persons who have demonstrated a credible fear of persecution merely because they are ill.

Madam Speaker. I appeal to the President and the Attorney General. We all are God's children.

AN INVITATION TO THE DEMOCRATS

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it appears that Democrats in the House have adopted a new motto for their party, "Don't get mad, get even."

At least that is the impression I get from reports that House Democrats were seeking ways to punish those members who had the courage to buck their party leadership and vote for their districts and against the largest tax increase in history.

It is outrageous that the party founded by Thomas Jefferson would stoop to strong-arm tactics that are more properly identified with the old Soviet Union, where party leaders really knew how to deal with uncooperative members.

For my part, I have never been prouder to be a Republican, a party in which members can vote their conscience without fear of blacklisting reprisals.

It must be hard to be a Democrat these days. So let me extend an invitation to all my colleagues on the other

side who cast a vote for fiscal sanity and are now unwelcome as leaders in their own party: to leave the Democrat's pup tent and come join us Republicans in our big tent. Everyone is welcome to represent the true interest of their constituents.

IMMIGRATION COMMISSIONER NEEDED

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, the Nation is facing many aggravating and painful problems concerning immigration and asylum. There is massive illegal entry into the Nation across the southern border. There is massive effort to smuggle people into the country, and most recently we have seen it in the form of the Chinese nationals who came in by ship into New York Harbor and San Francisco Bay.

There are hundreds of thousands of pending cases seeking asylum, some of which, many of which, are unfounded and invalid, and yet they clog up the court system and the administrative process denying court time and administrative time to people with valid claims of asylum.

Despite the fact that we are 5 months into the administration and despite the aggravating and persistent problems we have, we still do not have a Commissioner for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I have communicated with the Attorney General urging her to quickly assign someone that very difficult job.

I would hope that that Commissioner could be nominated and confirmed soon by the Senate. It is important to set good national policy in the immigration field, and for that we need an Immigration Commissioner.

THANKS BUT NO THANKS

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, well, after asking, begging, cajoling, and threatening his way to House passage of the largest tax increase in history, President Bill Clinton has backed away from his Btu tax.

Basically, he is saying to his House allies: "Thanks, but no thanks."

You have to wonder if this President ever means what he says.

I can only say to those who voted against history's largest tax increase: Do not worry. Be happy.

Do not worry, because your vote against the President may turn out to be a vote for the President once he finishes shifting his position.

Be happy, because voting against the largest tax increase in history is the right thing to do.

And if you are having difficulty with your own caucus because of your vote, let me say this: The Republican Party does not punish those who oppose tax increases. And we accept all who are unhappy with Bill Clinton's tax and spend economic program.

SUPPORT THE 1994 BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, as the 1994 budget resolution awaits passage in the Senate, I urge my colleagues and their constituents to be mindful of its benefits and not the rhetoric of its detractors.

I stand before you today seeking maximum support and consideration of those who stand to gain the most by the passage of the President's economic proposal and not those who gain headlines by opposing it.

We must remember the millions of children who go hungry each day and whose health is at risk due to lack of proper immunization.

We must remember those who want to work but lack the opportunity and training to do so.

We must remember that a fair tax system is one which works for all and not just for a chosen few.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that if we are to see long-term economic growth we must be willing to accept the short-term consequences of redirecting our spending priorities.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to hear this morning that President Clinton has abandoned the Btu tax. This hidden tax on energy would have hit my constituents in Michigan particularly hard. Estimates of its annual cost to Michigan families ranged from \$219 to over \$400.

The President should now take the next step and make clear that the tax is replaced with spending cuts, not a new tax. This can and should be done. This is what the American people want.

The Btu tax was slated to raise just over \$70 billion in revenues over 5 years. If the earned income tax credit increase—which was designed to offset the impact of the Btu on the poor—is removed from the plan, only \$40 billion in spending cuts is needed. This is approximately \$8 billion more in cuts in each of the next 5 years, considerably less than 1 percent of the spending that is scheduled to occur in the current budget plan.

This is an excellent opportunity for the president to show he is truly moving back to the political center. As my constituents put it "cut spending first."

OUR HISTORIC BUDGET PACKAGE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives recently passed a historic budget package that will cut the national debt by half a trillion dollars in the next 5 years. This package represents a bold restructuring of our economy to make economic growth possible after 12 years of policies that sapped our economic strength.

Few people now remember that in 1981, former President Ronald Reagan promised to eliminate the country's annual budget deficit by 1984.

But instead, during 12 years of Reagan-Bush policies, the national debt climbed from \$1.1 trillion to \$4 trillion. Interest payments on this debt alone cost the Nation nearly \$300 billion a year—about 13 percent of total yearly Federal spending.

When this House passed a budget package, we voted to take \$250 billion in Federal spending cuts and \$250 billion in new revenues and apply them toward the deficit over the next 5 years—reducing it by \$500 billion. We have started on the road to fiscal responsibility.

The Clinton economic package is a tough-minded approach to the economy and cutting the deficit. The result will be a stronger economy, more opportunity for job creation and investment, and a far brighter future for our children.

LIMIT JUDICIAL INTERFERENCE IN PRISONS

(Mr. CANADY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Prison Litigation Relief Act of 1993.

This legislation is designed to diminish the role of the Federal courts in prisons and jails.

In the name of inmate rights—the courts have imposed burdensome requirements on prisons in 40 States, the District of Columbia, and two territories.

They have mandated population caps on facilities, forcing the early release of dangerous criminals.

Such releases are contrary to both justice and deterrence.

Law-abiding citizens have the right to have criminals serve the full prison terms to which they have been sentenced.

Courts should not shorten those sentences by capping prison populations.

And, courts should not prohibit prisons from using reasonable housing alternatives such as tents and prefabricated structures for housing inmates.

If such accommodations are good enough for our soldiers, then they are certainly good enough for convicted criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the Prison Litigation Relief Act of 1993.

OUR CONSTITUENTS AND OUR COUNTRY MUST COME FIRST

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when a Member of Congress would have to look over their shoulder when they cast a vote, our great democracy will certainly be in danger. In fact, when any American walks into a jury room or a ballot box, no one shall either try to influence, intimidate, or coerce that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a subcommittee chairman who voted "no" on that tax bill, because I believed it was bad for the country. Our first loyalty in Congress should be to our country, and in my opinion, if the bill was bad for America, none of us would help our young President by casting a vote for it.

Let me remind the Members of Congress: If you do not have the guts and courage to vote "no" when it is necessary, your "yes" vote means nothing, and that is what is wrong with our country.

I support the President, but I did not support that bill, and I am not going to vote on any bill that I believe is bad for the country.

When it is a choice between the Democrat Party and what is good for my constituents and the country, the party is going to lose every damn time.

□ 1250

PRESIDENT CLINTON WOULD TAX MORE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, America's senior citizens will soon realize that President Clinton's tax package has a \$29 billion tax increase on Social Security.

That is right, \$29 billion which our senior citizens will have to pay. But get this: This huge tax increase is not called a tax increase, President Clinton is calling it a spending cut.

President Clinton said that senior citizens' Social Security will have to

be taxed to as much as 85 percent of their benefits.

The President says, "Where else can we cut?" Yesterday in our Committee on Foreign Affairs we looked at the State Department. The State Department is bloated, bloated, bloated. They have as many as 100 senior people with no duties, only huge salaries.

Yesterday I had an amendment to cut funding on the State Department by 10 percent. But the Democrats said "No." Why? Because the Democrats will tax Social Security but they will not cut the bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people's message to Congress must continue to be, "Cut spending first."

SUNS WAGER TO THE CHICAGO DELEGATION

(Mr. PASTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention a very important event beginning this evening. The Phoenix Suns, in their first NBA finals appearance since 1976, face off at home tonight against the Chicago Bulls. On the eve of Phoenix's first-ever NBA championship, I challenge my good friends from the Cook County delegation to a wager. If the Bulls win, the Arizona members of Congress will treat the Chicago delegation to an authentic, delicious dinner from Arizona's Mexican restaurant, Oaxaca. When, as expected, Phoenix Suns and Charles Barkley scorch the Bulls, my good friends from the State of Illinois can treat the Arizona delegation to a juicy steak dinner from Morton's Steakhouse of Chicago.

It is only fair to warn you, before you take up my offer, that the Suns boast a dazzling lineup including all-star Dan Majerle and the league's most valuable player, Charles Barkley. In the seventh game of the Western finals, Sir Charles scored 44 points with 24 rebounds. The Suns also have the best season record in the NBA and lead the league in postseason scoring. But I welcome the challenge from my Chicago colleagues, if you are up to it.

The fans of Phoenix and the great State of Arizona are revved up and ready to cheer their team to victory. My good friends from the State of Illinois, I hope you are ready to hand over our steak dinner. I am sorry to say there is no three-peat in store for Chicago.

PASS FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE REFORMS BEFORE THE NEXT HURRICANE DISASTER

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to issue a hurricane warning here this morning. While I address all the House I want to focus my remarks to those Members who come from Atlantic and Gulf Coast States.

We have had bad hurricanes lately; Andrew, the one that hit Charleston. But in reality we have been told by scientists that we have been at a lull. Now next year, according to a well-known atmospheric scientist who has a good track record, we can expect 11 hurricanes in the United States. Seven will be sufficiently intense that they can be named.

The bad news, Members, is we have \$36 million in the National Flood Insurance Program. An average intense hurricane can wipe out half a billion dollars in funds. FEMA estimates that we have, as of March, \$200 million and they are going to have to borrow money from the Federal Government to pay for floods in May in the Southwestern and Plains States.

Last year this Member along with Congressmen Erdreich and Carper brought a flood insurance reform bill to this floor. It passed here 388 to 18. Senator KERRY of the other body did an excellent job trying to bring that legislation, or its counterpart, to the other body. But it was blocked by one man.

I warn my colleagues we are going to have to take this reform because we are paying for unnecessary expensive replacement of structures all up and down our coasts. We have got a problem and we ought to face up to it now. I ask my colleagues on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs to move the legislation.

According to the scientific community, the coastal States are likely to experience many more storms, of the same magnitude as 1992's Hurricane Andrew, over the next 25 years. This prediction has also been made by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

During the last Congress, the House passed a flood insurance reform bill by an overwhelming vote of 388-18. Despite the many efforts by Senator JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, the Senate failed to pass a similar bill.

This Member urges, even warns, his colleagues on the House Banking Committee and his counterparts in the other body to take action in this Congress and put reforms in place before the next hurricane wreaks havoc on our coastlines and depletes the National Flood Insurance Fund.

Thank you.

DING DONG THE BTU TAX IS DEAD

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, ding dong the tax is dead; which old tax? The Btu. Ding dong the Btu is dead.

There will be real celebration among many areas of this country to know that Secretary Bentsen declared last night about midnight that the Btu tax is officially dead and there are many in this House who are grateful for that declaration.

We are not yet certain what the Senate will produce in its place, but at least this first step toward improving the President's economic plan is apparently accomplished. At least this bad idea of a Btu tax has finally been put to sleep.

CLINTON'S TAX BILL: WHERE IS CLINTON'S TAX CUT?

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, "I have a plan to get this economy moving and it starts with a middle-class tax cut." These were the refreshing words of candidate Bill Clinton on the campaign trail, the candidate who believed that tax cuts led to economic growth.

This statement reflects an understanding of economics and the responsiveness to public opinion.

However, now that he is in office President Clinton has forgotten what got him elected and is breaking his promises in order to pay for more big spending programs. Just when the economy is emerging from a recession caused in part by high taxes the President proposes to slam the brakes on the recovery with his tax bill. This tax package will reduce productivity and consumption, which will slow down a gradually recovering economy and cause another recession.

Last Saturday voters in Texas overwhelmingly supported KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, rejecting BOB KRUEGER and the tax and spend policies he represented. Yesterday in the city of Los Angeles where Democrats outnumber Republicans 61 percent to 25 percent, the Republican candidate won by 10 percent. As Democrat candidates try to distance themselves from a job-killing energy tax, a levy on seniors' Social Security benefits, and a hefty increase in income taxes, the voice of the people is being heard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to protect our constituents from the largest tax increase in the history of our country, President Clinton's tax plan. Let us cut Government spending further and give middle-class Americans the break that candidate Clinton promised them.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would take this moment to announce that under House

rules Members of the House should not urge nor ask for action in the other body.

PEOPLE HAVE BAD MOTIVES WHEN THEY HAVE GUNS: THEY KILL

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the National Rifle Association, the NRA, proclaims "Guns don't kill, people do."

Let me mention and share with you two incidents that occurred in my city that show the speciousness of the NRA's claim.

In one a 42-year-old schoolteacher was riding his bicycle in the park. Four young thugs tried to take the bicycle away from him. He resisted and as he rode away they shot him in the back, dead. He leaves a wife and two children as our whole community mourns.

In the second incident a young man in the other part of town, a 16-year-old, cried out as some thugs approached him "Don't kill me, don't kill me." The youth, Andre Sarvis, cried out as he was about to be shot, an eyewitness said, "But they shot him."

In each case, Mr. Speaker, there were bad people around. If the four youths in Prospect Park did not have guns the teacher would have rode away safely. If the young people, the young punks who shot this young man did not have guns, there might have been a black eye, perhaps even a broken nose, not a weeping family.

I would say to the NRA: People have bad motives, when they have guns they kill.

□ 1300

CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW YORK'S WESTHILL, A "BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL"

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the educators, administrators, students, and parents from the Westhill School District who have recently been honored by the U.S. Department of Education as a "Blue Ribbon School."

Not only is Westhill in my 25th District of New York, it is the school district in which I live. My son goes to Westhill Senior High School and my wife Dede and I have been very impressed with the attitude of the teaching team at Westhill. We and our neighbors are not surprised to learn of this tremendous recognition.

This honor, for outstanding excellence in a variety of areas, comes on the heels of another honor for Westhill.

Last year it was named by Redbook magazine as one of the top 140 high schools in the country.

Asked for a response by a local newspaper, Principal Richard Cavallaro properly gave credit to the students and faculty at Westhill who have established a team attitude that works. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating everyone at Westhill for this important and significant achievement.

I am very proud to represent these champions of education.

HEALTH CARE REFORM POLICY IN PUERTO RICO

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, my office has been told by the White House that health care reform policy advisors at the highest levels are recommending to the President that the U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico and the territories not be fully included in the national proposal because of the cost of Puerto Rico. They tell me the insular areas would have to meet employer mandates on health insurance, requiring every employer and employee to pay into the system, but would not be fully eligible for subsidies under the national program for the poor, unemployed, and the lower income.

What kind of policy is this? Puerto Rico and the territories are in, but they are out? Resident aliens on the mainland will have more rights and more benefits than the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other U.S. territories.

Why? Because Puerto Rico costs too much. Is this how we set health care policy? Is this how we treat American citizens in our Nation's territories?

As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the insular areas, I hope the President and the First Lady will not listen to advisors who say discriminate against medically needy U.S. citizens because it is just too much trouble to treat them fairly.

TIME FOR PARTISAN HAGGLING TO STOP

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned to find recently that certain Democratic Members of the Congress who refused to support the President's economic program due to excessive tax increases and a lack of spending cuts might be punished, have been threatened with punishment by the House Democratic leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the partisan haggling to stop. The American

people did not elect us to be Democrats first or Republicans first, but to be Americans first. They want us to put partisan politics aside and work on a bipartisan basis to build a brighter future for America.

Threatening subcommittee chairmen by the Democratic leadership in this Congress because they happened to vote their conscience for their districts in a way that was consistent with their own beliefs is not the way to put partisan bickering aside.

In sending Mr. Clinton to the White House, the American people endorsed a self-proclaimed new Democrat who sought to reduce Government spending, create jobs, decrease the tax burden on working Americans and support a balanced budget amendment.

As the President has abandoned these central themes of his campaign, his popularity has plummeted. Americans no longer have confidence in his ability to stimulate the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, in order to regain the support and the confidence of the American people, the President has to return to the principles of his campaign, the themes that he was elected on. As he moves to reduce the tax burden faced by working Americans, implement a balanced budget amendment and reduce Government spending, my colleagues and I pledge to fully support him.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together to create hope and opportunity for working Americans.

LYME DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this week is Lyme Disease Awareness Week. It is part of a national effort to educate people about how they can protect themselves against this tragic disease. It also underscores the urgent need for increased funding to develop a more reliable test for diagnosis, a more effective treatment, and—eventually—a cure.

Last year, nearly 10,000 people were diagnosed with Lyme disease—many of them in my home State of New Jersey. Nationwide this is an increase of 2.2 percent from 1991. And the Centers for Disease Control [CDC] estimates that this number may be deceptively low because so many cases go unreported or misdiagnosed each year.

Lyme disease is more than physically debilitating; it leaves its victims and loved ones emotionally drained as well. I represent the two most highly endemic counties in New Jersey and I have witnessed the devastating effects of this illness. During its active stages, individuals suffering with Lyme disease literally cannot function. They are crippled by extreme fatigue and disabling headaches.

Some of the most heartbreaking accounts that I have witnessed are of the young people stricken with Lyme. In Jackson Township, for instance, 170 students were diagnosed with Lyme disease last year—100 of them in the township middle school. Several of these children were so ill that they required home instruction. It takes little to recognize the staggering impact that such an illness makes on a young person's life.

To add insult to injury, this disease is enormously expensive. In addition to the numerous prescription drugs required—some of which cost up to \$550, patients require frequent lab tests and medical examinations by rheumatologists, neurologists, and general practitioners. IV therapy—recommended by many doctors as the most effective treatment—often leaves Lyme patients with thousands of dollars in medical bills.

Too often, insurance companies—operating on a strict policy of no more than 4 weeks of IV therapy—dump these bills right into the laps of the Lyme patients. In New Jersey, where we commemorated Lyme Disease Awareness Month in May, legislation is moving through the legislature to end this narrow-minded policy by requiring insurers to provide benefits for care deemed medically necessary by the attending physician. I highly commend this effort.

Lyme disease, which was early on believed to be a regionalized and low-key illness, has now spread to every State but Alaska and Montana. Nearly 50,000 cases of Lyme disease have been reported to the CDC since 1982, when the CDC began to record such data. New Jersey remains ranked highly on the list of those States most affected. Over the past year, I have held meetings, and facilitated public meetings with top researchers from the NIH and CDC as well as community activists and New Jersey officials in an effort to get the word out on Lyme disease and keep the gears moving smoothly toward an eventual cure.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to educate people about Lyme disease, to expand preventative measures and tick control, and to increase research for Lyme disease. Yet, funding for Lyme research remains static and scattered among several Federal agencies. The consensus in the medical and research communities is that better methods are needed for diagnosis, treatment, and prevention—it is up to us to act on this recommendation.

ARE THE DEMOCRATS LISTENING?

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the polls are closed. The ballots have

been counted and the whole State of Texas is speaking.

Are the liberal Democrats who control both Houses of Congress listening? Is the White House listening?

The election of a novice Republican businessman as mayor of Los Angeles, the 2 to 1 victory of the Republican candidate for the Senate in Texas are symbolic of a revolution sweeping our country.

The American people do not want any more taxes taken out of their take-home pay. They do not want to be taxed at the gas pump. They do not want to have taxes passed on to them hidden in the price of everything they buy as a result of supposedly taxing big business.

No new taxes. Read their lips. They mean it.

Ignore the voters at your own peril.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO CUT 25 PERCENT FROM CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the voice of the American people slowly but surely is penetrating the walls of this Congress of ours.

Today we read that the White House is apparently throwing in the towel on the Btu tax. It appears that the people's message is sinking in. Cut spending first.

I believe Americans see things pretty accurately in this historic budget debate. They see they are not undertaxed. They see that spending can be cut and cut boldly, and they see that right now Congress is not leading the way.

Instead, some in the Congress of this United States want to punish those who are not voting for big tax increases.

Well, this week we have a chance to show the American people that the U.S. House of Representatives is willing and able to lead by example and make bold cuts in our own overgrown bureaucracy.

We can do this by passing an amendment to cut 25 percent from congressional committee budgets.

We should cut spending first, Mr. Speaker, and we should first cut spending here in the Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF CAMPAIGN REFORM BILL

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation to reform certain activities in Congress and the way this House conducts its campaigns. A

major goal of this measure is to change the way candidates raise money.

My bill treats PAC's exactly the same as individuals, projects the same limits. It requires that 90 percent of candidates' contributions from within the candidate's State and 60 percent from the district which the candidate seeks to represent.

To remove the overwhelming incumbent advantage, and occasional abuse of free mail, my bill cuts franking budgets by 50 percent and prohibits bulk mailing within 180 days of an election.

Other provisions include banning soft money, denying tax deductions for lobbying activities, and prohibiting lobbyist paid travel for members and staff.

Last but not least, the bill includes term limitation language * * * unquestionably the most popular campaign reform idea in America today.

These provisions add up to real campaign reform that removes the undue influence of special interests, gives campaigns back to the voters a candidate has to face who he wishes to represent. It levels the playing field.

It will be a real Fourth of July present for America. I urge support.

NO RIGHT WAY TO DO THE WRONG THING

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no right way to do the wrong thing.

Not long ago this House passed by a margin of 219 to 213 a provision that would provide the biggest tax increase in the history of our country. That bill went over to the Senate and on to the President. The President and the Senate started to look for other ways to do it, because they say they want to get it right.

This morning in the Washington Post I read about a B-Be tax. I guess that stands for broad-based energy tax.

We hear from time to time about a VAT tax.

We hear from time to time about increasing income taxes even more than was proposed here on the floor.

Whether you do an increase in the income tax, a VAT tax, a B-Be tax, call it what you will, there simply is no right way to do the wrong thing.

□ 1310

BTU MEANS BILL'S TAXES, UNLIMITED

(Mr. MANZULLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, Btu stands for Bill's Taxes, Unlimited. My colleagues, perhaps we should have

some type of a game show called "Tax of the Week," or "Tax of the Day" or "Name That Tax," and they could open up screen No. 1, and they could have this tax; screen No. 2, this tax; and screen No. 3, that tax, and the grand prize of all is the biggest tax.

And now we have the biggest taxers saying, "I'm not really going to suggest what type of tax the Democratic majority comes up with, just my broad-based plan, and the Democrats can choose what type of tax they will give to the American taxpayer."

Mr. Speaker, the people back home are saying they have had enough taxes, they have had enough arm twisting set forth in the Washington Post, and they want their taxes decreased, they do not want them increased.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAYOR-ELECT RICHARD RIORDAN

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I take the well this afternoon to extend congratulations to the newly elected mayor of the city of Los Angeles, Richard Riordan. Mr. Riordan is a very successful businessman who was elected in large part on his commitment to bring a businesslike sense to the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that over the past several years Los Angeles has been one of the most troubled cities in our country due to racial problems, cutbacks in the defense and aerospace industries, and a wide range of other things. We need to have a new direction, and it seems to me that in the acceptance speech which he gave last night Mr. Riordan clearly stated where it is we want to go.

Mr. Speaker, he said:

Together we can deal with the problems of crime and drug trafficking. Together we can deal with the economic problems that we face in southern California. Together we can deal with the problems of education. There are a wide range of things that need to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish mayor-elect Riordan well as he takes on a very, very formidable challenge.

REPUBLICANS IN LOCKSTEP WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, one Member of the majority party earlier in the 1-minutes suggested that Republicans, because they voted unanimously against the tax increase, were forced into that position.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that that Member is not familiar with the facts and spoke only in emotion because the

fact is I am the guy who counts heads on the Republican side, and I can assure that Member that absolutely no one on the Republican side was forced to vote against the tax increase.

In fact, the Republicans recognized that we were on the same wave length with the American people, and every Republican realized that what they were doing was voting in lockstep with the American people, and so there was no attempt to force them to vote in lockstep with the Republican leadership. We were in lockstep with where the American people were, and Republicans proudly voted against the tax increase because they recognized that Americans are already taxed too much.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHANNON GRAY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment this morning to congratulate a very courageous young woman in my district who has taken on considerable odds to stand up for what she believes in.

This afternoon, Shannon Gray of Wolfson High School in Jacksonville, FL, will participate in her high school class graduation. She has stood up for the right of school children across this country to exercise their constitutional freedom of speech and choose to have a voluntary prayer as part of their graduation ceremony.

As a result of her initiative and the vote of a clear majority of her classmates, the graduating class of 1993 will be able to acknowledge the role that faith has played in their achievement. For them, the ceremony will be complete.

On Monday, the Supreme Court ruled that nonsectarian, student-initiated prayer could be included as part of public school graduation ceremonies. This was a welcome recognition by the Court that freedom of religion, not from religion, should be the standard for church-state relations.

Shannon Gray, her classmates, and students like her throughout this country have moved our Nation closer to a recognition of the appropriate role of religion in our society. I congratulate them on their graduation and this special achievement.

\$459,000 DOWN THE DRAIN

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times reported today that the U.S. Public Health Service has spent over \$4 million in the last 5 years sending its employees to the International AIDS Conference.

This week, 131 employees are attending at an average cost of \$3,500 per person.

These conferences really have been little more than taxpayer-funded vacations for bureaucrats.

The conferences have taken place in Montreal, San Francisco, Florence, Italy, Amsterdam, and now Berlin.

This week the Public Health Service is sending \$459,000 down the drain on this meeting.

The leading British scientific journal *Nature* said this week that "the AIDS conferences have outlived their usefulness" and "should be stopped."

In the same magazine, Dr. John Moore, of the Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center in New York, wrote:

The International AIDS meeting has long since shot its bolt as a worthwhile forum for debate—it is far too large, unfocused, and glitzy * * *

All over this country people want us to stop wasting so much tax money.

Yet many Federal bureaucrats know they are so protected by the civil service system that they can do anything they please, no matter how much it costs.

Four or five people could have easily represented the United States at this conference and brought back any worthwhile information.

This is a ridiculous waste of taxpayer funds. But next year we will spend hundreds of thousands more on this annual holiday. Next year it will be a junket to Japan.

PASSENGER VESSEL SAFETY ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1159.

□ 1316

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. TORRICELLI (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, May 24, 1993, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as read. The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text under the rule be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2. PASSENGER.

Section 2101(21) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(21) 'passenger'—

"(A) means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) the owner or an individual representative of the owner or, in the case of a vessel under charter, an individual charterer or individual representative of the charterer;

"(ii) the master; or

"(iii) a member of the crew engaged in the business of the vessel who has not contributed consideration for carriage and who is paid for on board services.

"(B) on an offshore supply vessel, means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) an individual included in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

"(ii) an employee of the owner, or of a subcontractor to the owner, engaged in the business of the owner;

"(iii) an employee of the charterer, or of a subcontractor to the charterer, engaged in the business of the charterer; or

"(iv) an individual employed in a phase of exploration, exploitation, or production of offshore mineral or energy resources served by the vessel.

"(C) on a fishing vessel, fish processing vessel, or fish tender vessel, means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) an individual included in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

"(ii) a managing operator;

"(iii) an employee of the owner, or of a subcontractor to the owner, engaged in the business of the owner; or

"(iv) an employee of the charterer, or of a subcontractor to the charterer, engaged in the business of the charterer.

"(D) on a sailing school vessel, means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) an individual included in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

"(ii) an employee of the owner of the vessel engaged in the business of the owner, except when the vessel is operating under a demise charter;

"(iii) an employee of the demise charterer of the vessel engaged in the business of the demise charterer; or

"(iv) a sailing school instructor or sailing school student."

SEC. 3. PASSENGER VESSEL.

Section 2101(22) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(22) 'passenger vessel' means a vessel of at least 100 gross tons—

"(A) carrying more than 12 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire;

"(B) that is chartered and carrying more than 12 passengers; or

"(C) that is a submersible vessel carrying at least one passenger for hire."

SEC. 4. SMALL PASSENGER VESSEL.

Section 2101(35) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(35) 'small passenger vessel' means a vessel of less than 100 gross tons—

"(A) carrying more than 6 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire;

"(B) that is chartered with the crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying more than 6 passengers;

"(C) that is chartered with no crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying more than 12 passengers; or

"(D) that is a submersible vessel carrying at least one passenger for hire."

SEC. 5. UNINSPECTED PASSENGER VESSEL.

Section 2101(42) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(42) 'uninspected passenger vessel' means an uninspected vessel—

"(A) of at least 100 gross tons—

"(i) carrying not more than 12 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire; or

"(ii) that is chartered with the crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying not more than 12 passengers; and

"(B) of less than 100 gross tons—

"(i) carrying not more than 6 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire; or

"(ii) that is chartered with the crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying not more than 6 passengers."

SEC. 6. PASSENGER FOR HIRE.

Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (21) and (22) a new paragraph (21a) to read as follows:

"(21a) 'passenger for hire' means a passenger for whom consideration is contribution as a condition of carriage on the vessel, whether directly or indirectly flowing to the owner, charterer, operator, agent, or any other person having an interest in the vessel."

SEC. 7. CONSIDERATION.

Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (5) and (6) a new paragraph (5a) to read as follows:

"(5a) 'consideration' means an economic benefit, inducement, right, or profit including pecuniary payment accruing to an individual, person, or entity, but not including a voluntary sharing of the actual expenses of the voyage, by monetary contribution or donation of fuel, food, beverage, or other supplies."

SEC. 8. OFFSHORE SUPPLY VESSEL.

Section 2101(19) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting "individuals in addition to the crew," immediately after "supplies," and by striking everything after "resources" to the period at the end.

SEC. 9. SAILING SCHOOL VESSEL.

Section 2101(30) of title 46, United States Code, is amended in subparagraph (B) by striking "at least 6" and substituting "more than 6".

SEC. 10. SUBMERSIBLE VESSEL.

Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (37) and (38) a new paragraph (37a) to read as follows:

"(37a) 'submersible vessel' means a vessel that is capable of operating below the surface of the water."

SEC. 11. GENERAL PROVISION.

(a) Section 2113 of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§2113. Authority to exempt certain vessels"

"If the Secretary decides that the application of a provision of part B, C, F, or G of this subtitle is not necessary in performing the mission of the vessel engaged in excursions or an oceanographic research vessel, or not necessary for the safe operation of certain passenger vessels, the Secretary by regulation may—

"(1) for an excursion vessel, issue a special permit specifying the conditions of operation and equipment;

"(2) exempt an oceanographic research vessel from that provision under conditions the Secretary may specify; and

"(3) establish different operating and equipment requirements for vessels defined in section 2101(42)(A) of this title."

(b) Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before the text; and
(2) by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Within twenty-four months of the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall, by regulation, require certain additional equipment including liferafts or other lifesaving equipment, construction standards, or specify additional operating standards for those uninspected passenger vessels defined in section 2101(42)(A) of this title."

SEC. 12. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) Regulations governing small passenger vessels and passenger vessels, as those terms are defined in 46 U.S.C. 2101, which are chartered with no crew provided shall not apply before May 1, 1994.

(b) The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may extend the time period for compliance with the regulations referenced in subsection (a) for an additional period of up to one year if the owner of the vessel demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that a good faith effort, with due diligence and care, has failed to enable compliance with the deadline under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAUZIN

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAUZIN:
Page 8, line 6, strike "passenger vessels" and insert "vessels carrying passengers".

Page 8, line 24, strike "including and insert "which may include".

Mr. TAUZIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes two technical changes to section 11 of the bill which is a section that authorizes the Coast Guard to issue exemptions to passenger vessels under limited circumstances. The term "passenger vessel" is defined under the law to be those vessels over 100 gross tons and are the most stringently regulated. The use of the term "passenger vessel" was a drafting error. The first amendment clarifies that the Coast Guard has the authority to exempt inspected vessels carrying passengers from the more stringent

regulations for special occasions such as fundraisers through the excursion permit process. The vessel will still have to satisfy the Coast Guard as being safe. There are some vessels, such as Hatteras yachts, which have an excellent safety record, which are well-constructed vessels, which do not meet the current stringent hull requirements. The second provision allows the Coast Guard to adopt new rules designed specifically to provide for these types of fiberglass hulls. This change clarifies that the Coast Guard is not mandated to issue regulations in each of the areas listed. Rather these are areas that should be considered when developing the regulations, and I move adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman's amendment has been cleared by the minority staff and this amendment is basically technical in nature.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, that is the understanding of the gentleman here.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge all Republican Members to vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1320

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEUTSCH: Section 12(b) of H.R. 1159 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may extend the time period for compliance with the regulations referenced in subsection (a) for an initial period of up to one year and may extend the period of compliance for one additional period of up to one year if the owner of the vessel demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that a good faith effort, with due diligence and care, has failed to enable compliance with the deadline under subsection (a)."

Mr. DEUTSCH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TORRICELLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, safety on the water is of importance to us all and to our constituents. However, as we legislate new requirements on bareboat operators around the country, we should also strive for fairness. This

amendment would provide some fairness to those bareboat charter operators who make a good faith effort to come into compliance with the provisions of the Passenger Vessel Safety Act, but are unable to do so within the timetable assigned under the current bill.

Questions have arisen as to the fairness of the deadline for compliance with the provisions of this bill. Currently, the bill requires that vessels come into compliance with the bill by May 1, 1994. Additionally, an owner of a vessel can petition for a 1-year extension to come into compliance. The Coast Guard can grant this application if, and only if, the owner is making a good faith effort to come into compliance with the regulations. However, the economics of this situation dictate that it may not be possible for boat owners to come into compliance within this time period. My amendment would amend section 12(b) of the bill, to give owners the ability to petition for, and the Coast Guard the authority to provide, a second 1-year extension, provided the owner of the vessel is making a good faith effort to come into compliance.

While this bill closes the loophole that allows bareboat charter operations to act as de facto uninspected large passenger vessels, as a result of this bill, many bareboat operators will be forced to undergo the expense of retrofitting their boats to come into compliance with the more stringent regulations. In some cases, these costs will run upwards of \$150,000, a significant expense for these small businesses. It may take time for the owners of these vessels to make all of the necessary improvements. However, under my amendment, should the owner of a vessel make the effort to come into compliance, for example, making some of the necessary improvements, the Coast Guard would have the authority to grant an additional year's extension.

Another potential problem for owners of vessels is space in shipyards. While there are a limited number of shipyards in south Florida and around the country, it may be difficult for some owners of vessels to come into compliance purely out of a lack of space.

This amendment is not an attempt to create another loophole for unsafe boats. Rather, this amendment seeks to provide a means through which the Coast Guard can implement these regulations, allowing the Coast Guard to provide an additional year to complete the retrofitting of their boats. This amendment will, in no way, allow an unsafe boat to operate, as the additional year is contingent on the Coast Guard granting a waiver to the owner who is making a good faith effort to come into compliance with the more stringent regulations.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. STUDDS, and his fine staff for all of their assistance in this matter. I think that this amendment represents a fair compromise that will enable more boats to come into compliance with these regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I would just advise the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] that this amendment is very much in the spirit of the bill as reported by the committee and has our support.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the minority has reviewed this amendment and I must say in all candor that I have some concerns about this proposed change.

During our subcommittee markup of H.R. 1159, the distinguished author of the bill, BILLY TAUZIN, successfully offered an amendment to extend from 1 to 2 years the phase in of the Coast Guard inspection requirements.

Frankly, I believe that 2 years is a generous concession to these bareboat charter operators and it will give them adequate time to acquire any necessary safety equipment or to retrofit their vessels.

We must remember that the fundamental goal of this legislation is to protect the lives of Americans who now sail on potentially unsafe bareboat charters. It seems to me that a 2-year phase in is more than sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, while I will not ask for a recorded vote on this amendment, since it is discretionary in nature, it is my hope that the Coast Guard will not utilize this language and will not delay the enforcement of these regulations 1 day longer than necessary.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state for the RECORD that I share the same concerns that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] has expressed. As the gentleman knows, we did amend the bill to create the 1-year additional authorizing period for these compliances to take place.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], however, has brought to our attention the possibility in very rare circumstances where a shipyard capacity may not be available to a boatowner in time for him to make the necessary hull repairs or configuration changes as required under the new stringent regulations. Under that rare circumstance, the gentleman's amendment would give the Coast Guard dis-

cretion only to give them additional time to comply.

Mr. Chairman, while it does open the door a bit to extending the time period beyond that which we agreed to in committee, I nevertheless think it tightly enough is written and the Coast Guard, I think, has been properly advised that this section should only be used in the rarest of circumstances, where those circumstances exist where compliance cannot be achieved in time.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I think the amendment is not perhaps as bad as it might read on its face.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN]. It is because of the concerns of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] and the point that he made that I will not ask for a recorded vote. But again, I think for the RECORD, it is important to state on our side of the aisle that we have few concerns, particularly based on the deft and great craftsmanship of your legislative vehicle in our committee.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING USE OF VESSELS CONSTRUCTED IN UNITED STATES FOR CARRYING PASSENGERS FOR HIRE.

It is the sense of the Congress that persons who, for the purpose of carrying passengers for hire in the United States, operate or charter vessels with respect to which this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) applies should only operate and charter for that purpose vessels constructed in the United States.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is basically a sense-of-the-Congress amendment that persons who carry passengers for hire whenever possible operate in charter vessels that are made in America.

I would like to say to the Congress of the United States that if more Americans bought more American-made products, we could do with a lot less tax increases and have a much more robust and vibrant economy.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to argue with the spirit and thrust of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] seeks to do.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with this amendment and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, before we move to final passage on this measure, let me acknowledge the work of a gentleman dedicated to saving lives and dedicated to his service. Capt. Robert North, Deputy Chief of the Coast Guard Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection Office, first brought this issue to our attention more than a year ago. Captain North has brought his field experiences to bear in making needed changes in the law to protect the lives of unsuspecting bareboat charterers.

Mr. Chairman, Captain North should be congratulated for his efforts.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. TORRICELLI, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1159) to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 172, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 4, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Crane	Hastings
Ackerman	Crapo	Hayes
Allard	Cunningham	Hefley
Andrews (ME)	Danner	Hefner
Andrews (NJ)	Darden	Herger
Andrews (TX)	de la Garza	Hilliard
Applegate	Deal	Hinchey
Archer	DeLauro	Hoagland
Armey	DeLay	Hobson
Bacchus (FL)	Dellums	Hochbrueckner
Bacchus (AL)	Derrick	Hoke
Baessler	Deutsch	Holden
Baker (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Baker (LA)	Dickey	Houghton
Ballenger	Dicks	Hoyer
Barca	Dingell	Huffington
Barcia	Dixon	Hughes
Barlow	Dooley	Hunter
Barrett (NE)	Dreier	Hutchinson
Barrett (WI)	Duncan	Hutto
Bartlett	Dunn	Hyde
Barton	Durbin	Inglis
Bateman	Edwards (CA)	Inhofe
Becerra	Edwards (TX)	Inslee
Beilenson	Emerson	Istook
Bentley	Engel	Jacobs
Bereuter	English (AZ)	Jefferson
Berman	English (OK)	Johnson (CT)
Beverly	Eshoo	Johnson (SD)
Bilbray	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Billirakis	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Blackwell	Ewing	Johnston
Billey	Fawell	Kanjorski
Blute	Fazio	Kaptur
Boehlert	Fields (LA)	Kasich
Boehner	Fields (TX)	Kennedy
Bonilla	Filner	Kennelly
Bonior	Fingerhut	Kildee
Borski	Fish	Kim
Boucher	Flake	King
Brewster	Foglietta	Kingston
Browder	Ford (MI)	Klecza
Brown (CA)	Ford (TN)	Klein
Brown (FL)	Fowler	Klink
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Klug
Bryant	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Burton	Frost	Kopetski
Buyer	Furse	Kreidler
Byrne	Galleghy	Kyl
Callahan	Gallo	LaFalce
Calvert	Gedensson	Lambert
Camp	Gekas	Lancaster
Canady	Gephardt	Lantos
Cantwell	Geren	LaRocco
Cardin	Gibbons	Laughlin
Carr	Gillmor	Lazio
Castle	Gilman	Leach
Chapman	Gingrich	Levin
Clay	Glickman	Levy
Clayton	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Clement	Gordon	Lewis (FL)
Clinger	Goss	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Grams	Lightfoot
Coble	Grandy	Linder
Coleman	Green	Lipinski
Collins (IL)	Greenwood	Lloyd
Collins (MI)	Gunderson	Long
Combest	Gutierrez	Lowe
Condit	Hall (OH)	Machtley
Conyers	Hall (TX)	Maloney
Cooper	Hamburg	Mann
Coppersmith	Hamilton	Manton
Costello	Hancock	Manzullo
Cox	Hansen	Margolies-
Coyne	Harman	Mezvinsky
Cramer	Hastert	Markey

Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek

Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)

Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Santorum
Sarpaluis
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenck
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slatery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)

Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Weidon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—4

Doolittle
Penny

Stump
Walker

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop
Brooks
Collins (GA)
DeFazio
Dornan
Gilchrest
Goodlatte

Goodling
Henry
Hoekstra
Johnson (GA)
Lehman
Livingston
Payne (NJ)

Rowland
Velazquez
Washington
Waxman
Whitten
Wilson

□ 1351

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1159, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present to vote on rollcall vote 201 to approve the journal. I was attending to a family member who was undergoing surgery.

I also regret that I was not present to vote on rollcall vote 202, on the "Passenger Vessel Safety Act." If I was present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes No. 201 & 202, I was on official business in Georgia regarding the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on these two measures.

UNCLAIMED DEPOSITS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 890) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to improve the procedures for treating unclaimed insured deposits, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TREATMENT OF UNCLAIMED DEPOSITS AT INSURED BANKS AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.

Subsection (e) of section 12 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1822(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) DISPOSITION OF UNCLAIMED DEPOSITS.—

"(1) NOTICES.—

"(A) FIRST NOTICE.—Within 30 days after the initiation of the payment of insured deposits under section 11(f), the Corporation shall provide written notice to all insured depositors that they must claim their deposit from the Corporation, or if the deposit has been transferred to another institution, from the transferee institution.

"(B) SECOND NOTICE.—A second notice containing this information shall be mailed by the Corporation to all insured depositors who have not responded to the first notice, 15 months after the Corporation initiates such payment of insured depositors.

"(C) ADDRESS.—The notices shall be mailed to the last known address of the depositor appearing on the records of the insured depository institution in default.

"(2) TRANSFER TO APPROPRIATE STATE.—If an insured depositor fails to make a claim for his, her, or its insured or transferred deposit within 18 months after the Corporation initiates the payment of insured deposits under section 11(f)—

"(A) any transferee institution shall refund the deposit to the Corporation, and all rights of the depositor against the transferee institution shall be barred; and

"(B) with the exception of United States deposits, the Corporation shall deliver the deposit to the custody of the appropriate State as unclaimed property, unless the appropriate State declines to accept custody. Upon delivery to the appropriate State, all rights of the depositor against the Corporation with respect to the deposit shall be barred and the Corporation shall be deemed to have made payment to the depositor for purposes of section 11(g)(1).

"(3) REFUSAL OF APPROPRIATE STATE TO ACCEPT CUSTODY.—If the appropriate State declines to accept custody of the deposit tendered pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), the deposit shall not be delivered to any State, and the insured depositor shall claim the deposit from the Corporation before the receivership is terminated, or all rights of the depositor with respect to such deposit shall be barred.

"(4) TREATMENT OF UNITED STATES DEPOSITS.—If the deposit is a United States deposit it shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury. Upon delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury, all rights of the depositor against the Corporation with respect to the deposit shall be barred and the Corporation shall be deemed to have made payment to the depositor for purposes of section 11(g)(1).

"(5) REVERSION.—If a depositor does not claim the deposit delivered to the custody of the appropriate State pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) within 10 years of the date of delivery, the deposit shall be immediately refunded to the Corporation and become its property. All rights of the depositor against the appropriate State with respect to such deposit shall be barred as of the date of the refund to the Corporation.

"(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'transferee institution' means the insured depository institution in which the Corporation has made available a transferred deposit pursuant to section 11(f)(1);

"(B) the term 'appropriate State' means the State to which notice was mailed under paragraph (1)(C), except that if the notice was not mailed to an address that is within a State it shall mean the State in which the depository institution in default has its main office; and

"(C) the term 'United States deposit' means an insured or transferred deposit for which the deposit records of the depository institution in default disclose that title to the deposit is held by the United States, any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, or any officer or employee thereof in such person's official capacity."

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 1 of this Act shall only apply with respect to institutions for which the Corporation has initiated the payment of insured deposits under section 11(f) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR RECEIVERSHIPS IN PROGRESS.—Section 12(e) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act shall apply with respect to insured deposits in depository institutions for which the Corporation was first appointed receiver during the period between January 1, 1989 and the date of enactment of this Act, except that such section 12(e) shall not bar any claim made against the Corporation by an insured depositor for an insured or transferred deposit, so long as such claim is made prior to the termination of the receivership.

(c) INFORMATION TO STATES.—Within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall provide, at the request of and for the sole use of any State, the name and last known address of any insured depositor (as shown on the records of the institution in de-

fault) eligible to make a claim against the Corporation solely due to the operation of subsection (b) of this section.

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "Corporation" means the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Resolution Trust Corporation, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, as appropriate.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to improve the procedures for treating unclaimed insured deposits, and for other purposes."

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would not really like to object, but I reserve my right to object in order to allow the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institution Supervision, Regulation, and Deposit Insurance to explain what he is about. I think it is important that we understand what this is all about, and I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for that purpose.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on March 2, the House passed H.R. 890, the Unclaimed Deposits Amendments Act of 1993 to protect the insured deposits of persons who may have inadvertently abandoned them.

Our colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK, worked hard on this issue. He was the moving force behind the legislation in both the previous and current Congresses. Without his efforts, the legislation would not have been passed.

On May 27, the Senate passed the legislation with an amendment. The amendment is largely technical in nature, and simply clarifies the language of the House bill. I have no objection to the Senate amendment, and know of no objections to it.

Currently depositors have 18 months in which to file claims for deposit insurance. H.R. 890 would protect depositors who fail to file claims by requiring the FDIC and RTC to offer the insured deposits to the States to accept and hold under State abandoned property law for a period of 10 years. The States would use their established procedures to try to find the owners of these deposits. Only after this period had expired would the unclaimed funds revert back to the FDIC or the RTC or its successor, with all further claims to these funds barred. This bill therefore allows depositors up to 10 years to make a claim on their insured deposits.

At hearings held in February by the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, which I chair, witnesses from the FDIC

and the RTC testified in favor of the legislation. Neither agency has any objection to the Senate amendment.

Our Federal deposit insurance pledge is there to protect our Nation's depositors. This bill assures that all insured depositors will fully protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, with the increase in bank and thrift closures in the last few years, a number of depositors have inadvertently surrendered their rights to their deposits, and that is what this bill is all about, as I understand from what the gentleman from North Carolina has explained. In most of these cases they did not receive notice or did not have an adequate amount of time to make their claims, and that is particularly true where long-term certificates of deposit were purchased.

It is my understanding, and if I am incorrect I would ask the gentleman to let me know, that H.R. 890, as modified by the Senate, gives depositors a reasonable time to make claims, and solicits the help of the States in locating depositors. Is that not correct?

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I think it is a very simple bill. It is a very fair bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 890 and the Senate amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an explanation for my absence, yesterday, June 8, 1993.

As I was testifying before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission in Atlanta, GA, regarding the review of the Jacksonville Naval Aviation Depot which provides many jobs for my constituents, I was unable to be present for votes yesterday. If I were present, I would have voted "no."

A PRESCRIPTION FOR FOREST HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAROCO. Mr. Speaker, 1993 marks a watershed year for a major public policy shift in forest management. As in the past, watersheds are the result of widespread change in public attitudes, actions, as well as changes in natural conditions—and require responsiveness on the part of policymakers.

PAST WATERSHEDS IN FOREST POLICY

For example, a policy shift of the past occurred against the backdrop of widespread public perception that forests in the East and Midwest had been overcut and abandoned by private timber companies that had moved West. At that time, the Forest Reserve System was being managed by the Interior Department, which was, itself, suffering from a long history of scandal, including the Teapot Dome.

The father of professional forestry in the United States, Gifford Pinchot, was working in the Department of Agriculture. Pinchot shared the public's distrust of the Interior Department, and in 1905, convinced President Theodore Roosevelt and Congress that the forest reserves should be renamed "national forests" and moved from Interior to Agriculture where they could be properly managed under his bureau which was renamed the "Forest Service."

In more recent times, another shift in forest policy followed clearcutting on the Monongahela in West Virginia. Public outcry led to a lawsuit that correctly asserted clearcutting was illegal under the 1897 Organic Act of the Forest Service which authorized timber sales. The policy result—enactment of the National Forest Management Act in 1976.

One final example involved changing and conflicting use patterns on national forests after World War II which led to a big change in national forest policy.

With an expanding affluence during the 1950's and 1960's, came a paralleled increase in leisure time, which led to an explosion in outdoor recreation that has not abated.

Another changing use pattern occurring at that time, which was related to the baby boom and economic recovery, was an increased demand for wood to build houses. As a result, timber harvest on national forests tripled during the decade of the 1950's.

Three other related events included an attempt by the forest industry to obtain compensation for timber lands being flooded by Federal reservoirs. Most companies preferred to be compensated by selecting national forest lands rather than cash.

Also, ranchers were pushing for changes to the grazing system which

would allow them greater influence over allotment management. And, in 1955 came the first attempt at enactment of a wilderness bill.

As a result of competing uses vying for more control over management of national forest lands, the Forest Service had a real need for striking a balance. Congress gave them a tool to accomplish that in the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act.

TODAY'S CHANGES

And now, in 1993, the stars seem to be realigning for yet another watershed change in forest management policy. And during the following few minutes, I hope to make the case for Congress and the administration to move ahead, with the involvement of all affected parties, to direct land management agencies on forest health and ecosystem management.

One phenomenon foreshadowing a policy change is that many forest systems are on the verge of collapse due to years of overeffective fire suppression and turn of the century logging practices. This pattern of historic use and management has been brought to a crisis by recent drought conditions.

FIRE

Before fire suppression and intensive forest management, fire was nature's tool to maintain a balance. Fire naturally thinned our forests and maintained an optimum number of trees per acre, all competing for limited quantities of water, nutrients, sunlight, and growing space.

But, those who settled the West concluded forest fires were a big threat to people and resources. The decision to suppress fires seemed the right thing to do. But the reduction of fire has had ramifications that reverberate throughout the forests today. Over time, without fire there was a steady change in the structure of our forests, species composition and the number of trees competing for limited resources.

Some of the gravest forest health problems in Idaho are occurring in ecosystems which historically contained mostly long-needled pines adapted to fires at short intervals. But these conditions have been altered by decades of fire suppression and management practices that selectively removed the commercially valuable pines.

These same harvest and fire suppression practices favored high reproduction and growth of true fir and Douglas-fir species that are particularly susceptible to drought and pests on dry sites. In the past, periodic low intensity wildfires kept these species in check while sparing the fire-adapted ponderosa pine and larch.

For example, in the mid-1800's, open stands dominated by ponderosa pine and larch covered 70 percent of the Blue Mountain forests of northeast Oregon. Today, they cover only 30 percent, while dense stands of true fir,

Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine, and spruce dominate 70 percent of these forests.

Now, pest problems have increased due to the many weakened trees. And as trees continue to succumb to these attacks, forest become virtual tinderboxes ready to explode into disastrous wildfires.

In central and southern Idaho, the Payette and Boise National Forests are experiencing catastrophic damage from insect and disease attack. Both forests are dying significantly faster than they are growing. The statistics are startling and telling.

On the Payette's timber land, average mortality is 407 board feet per acre, while growth is only 248 board feet. Mortality figures on the Boise are even worse. Since 1988, the forest has lost more than 400,000 trees on more than 1 million acres of affected forest.

While many scientists believe that low-intensity fires and prescribed burns should eventually become part of the management regime, the risk of using fire under current conditions is high. William Gast, who headed the Blue Mountain forest health study, told the Oregonian, "Because the fuel load is so high, a fire would burn so hot it could break down the structure of the soil and reduce soil productivity. That fact complicates letting nature take its course."

What are the dangers of high intensity wildfires?

With current fuel loads, wildfires are capable of setting the ecological clock back to zero. Even the most fire-resistant old-growth ponderosa pines, currently mixed in with ailing firs, are at risk, particularly if flames climb to the top of the trees and race through the crowns.

In areas where the ground is covered with large amounts of dead, dry fuel, fire can scorch the earth, destroy soil organic matter and even fire clays in the soil into lifeless ceramic bricks.

Under current conditions, fires pose a tremendous hazard to the many communities, homes, and people that have located in forested areas in recent years. On one windy day, alone, in 1991 the more than 90 wildfires destroyed 112 homes in the inland Northwest.

Insect-damaged riparian areas, which provide habitat for native fish and threatened salmon, carry enormous fuel loads and face the potential of extreme postwildfire erosion.

DROUGHT

And, according to a recent article in the Spokane Spokesman-Review, fire officials say that although many places in Idaho experienced a long winter and wet spring, this does not mean an end to the 6-year drought. The snow that buried the panhandle for nearly 3 months was great for skiing, but contained only half the typical moisture content. And the wet spring has given north Idaho a good crop of nice, green grass that will be good fuel as it dries in the summer.

SPOTTED OWL, ESA, AND ECOSYSTEM
MANAGEMENT

Another factor aligning with forest health concerns to precipitate a policy change is the evolution of the spotted owl debate and the listings of large numbers of fish and wildlife under the Endangered Species Act.

And, converging with the unraveling of forest systems of the West is the development of ecosystem management, which may be more a consequence of change than a cause. As multiple-use was to the 1960's, ecosystem management is being explored as a solution to today's natural resource management problems. Ecosystem restoration action is needed to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire, and to repair watersheds and restore the natural dynamics and resilience of forest systems.

I've heard many people say ecosystem management sounds great in theory, but what does it really mean? In a recent National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee oversight hearing on rehabilitation, reforestation, and reinvestment on national forests of the Pacific Northwest, I took the opportunity to ask Forest Service Chief Dale Robertson for a definition of ecosystem management. He said, "Ecosystem management means sustainability of all uses and values of the forest, and we will manage these forests for healthy, productive, biologically diverse ecosystems over time."

He went on to explain:

We are going to get out of the plantation forestry business and try to maintain very much of the diversity that exists in a natural forest such as big trees and a diverse canopy. It means our people on the ground are making some different kinds of decisions so that this forest will look different than it has in the past. You will not see these big square clearcuts or plantation forestry.

The Natural Resources Committee continues to explore the parameters of ecosystem management. On May 16, I attended a workshop at the Black Butte Ranch south of Bozeman, MT. The workshop brought together scientists and members of the House Natural Resources Committee to explore informally the issues and challenges associated with ecosystem management in the northern Rockies.

There was a consensus among these scientists that land and water resources are currently managed in a fragmented manner, and that coordinated and comprehensive management is highly desirable. They also agreed that, because ecosystem protection necessarily involves management, it cannot be completely equated with wilderness, and that the human dimension—stable communities founded on sustainable resources—is a viable component.

Similar workshops and hearings will help the committee identify steps that Congress may wish to initiate to overcome the legal and institutional barriers to sound ecosystem management.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

And finally, I would like to emphasize the importance of the Clinton administration in establishing a critical mass for change. The American people finally have in place an administration with a strong desire to govern and to listen to science.

Furthermore, with an administration friendly to the leadership in Congress, there is reestablished a trust which has been absent for years. For example, if the Natural Resources Committee believes the administration should go first in addressing the spotted owl situation of the Northwest, Congress will wait for the administration to take the lead and accomplish what it can.

And, when it does come time for legislation, with this new spirit of cooperation, bills which move through Congress will actually be signed into law by the President.

NATIONAL FOREST HEALTH ACT

Last year, as many of you are aware, I introduced the National Forest Health Act of 1992 to bring focus to and begin a dialog on the issue of forest health. With the bipartisan cosponsorship of 30 Members of the House of Representatives I was able to steer that legislation through the full Agriculture Committee. And, this Congress, I continue to stir the pot by reintroducing that bill approved by the Agriculture Committee as H.R. 229.

My bill authorizes the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to carry out forest health improvement programs, in consultation with State and Federal fish, wildlife and cooperative forestry experts, in an effort to reduce further damage to forest resources and promote management of sustained, diverse, and healthy forest ecosystems.

These lands are to be recognized as a forest health emergency for a specific length of time, until conditions favorable to forest health are restored. And, at the request of the Governor of an affected State, adjacent State and private lands can be included in the emergency areas and become eligible for Federal assistance to address forest health problems.

STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS

Another measure included in my bill is a provision for multiple-year contracts where the focus is on longterm outcomes, not outputs. The fiscal year 1992 and 1993 appropriations bills for the Forest Service directed the agency to test this new land stewardship contract approach to Federal timber sale contracting on several western national forests including the Idaho Panhandle. And the agency is experiencing success.

The appropriations bills directed that stewardship contracts be used to "help the private sector promote the Forest Service ecosystem management initiative * * * and to give contractors an incentive to become as concerned with sustaining ecosystems as with sustaining trees."

In terms of procedure, this system would allow the Forest Service to contract for an array of ecosystem management and ecological restoration services as part of a total land management package deal with a single contractor. The contractor would be compensated for these services by receiving credit toward the amount owed to the Forest Service for timber harvested as part of the contract activities. This approach is essentially the same as the purchaser credit system used for many years to compensate timber purchasers for road construction and maintenance associated with a timber sale.

On the panhandle, representatives of the Forest Service, timber industry and environmental community are closely involved in shaping a land stewardship project which is not too complicated, to increase the chance of success. Some of what is being considered is helicopter logging, logs being cut to length by a forwarder, some conventional logging, stream course rehabilitation, addressing road and water quality problems, and fencing for grazing.

In addition to the potential for enactment, the introduction of legislation generates spinoff benefits which bring focus and clarity to an issue, which has certainly been the case with my forest health bill.

REPORT RESULTS FROM HEARINGS

In response to my legislation, the Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms and Energy of the Agriculture Committee held three hearings on forest health, one in Coeur d'Alene on Memorial Day of last year. The testimony received during those hearings should not, in my judgment, be lost or set aside because it continues to provide a foundation upon which to build.

For example, primarily in response to hearings on my legislation, a forest health report was released in May by the Chief of the Forest Service. The introduction to the report states, "During the hearings, members of Congress asked how the forests recently damaged by drought, pest epidemics, and wildfires will be restored and how similar damage will be prevented elsewhere."

The report further states:

The strategic goals and actions in this plan support the new emphasis on ecosystem management in the National Forest System. * * * will help strengthen Forest Service cooperative programs and provide for better coordination and assistance on forest health problems. * * * and will lead to better integration of forest health considerations into agency planning and decision making.

CHANGES IN GREEN SLIP PROGRAM

An additional benefit was that, throughout the hearing process, I learned about changes which need to be made to my bill—information that will be invaluable in improving any legislative package.

In Coeur d'Alene, small logging operators urged an increase in the number

of small sales on national forests and a return of the greenslip program.

In a followup letter to the hearing, Chief Dale Robertson stated:

Reductions in the Region's large sale program have also reduced the contract work available to many of the small, independent operators. Because of this, the operators have shown increasing interest in securing small sales, as well as salvaging dead, dying and blowdown timber. The result has been a demand for both small sales and salvage sales that the Ranger Districts cannot meet, and the need to advertise the sales that they can offer.

The Chief went on to provide valuable information which identified barriers the agency faced in regards to green slip sales including their limited application, inadequate resource protection, legal requirements of the agency to offer sales under competitive bid, and the high unit cost for preparation and administration of these sales in a time when there is increased emphasis on cost efficiency for the agency's timber sale program.

OBSTACLES FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY

Also, in response to questions raised at the Coeur d'Alene hearing, the Forest Service indicated that in fiscal year 1991, 28 percent, or 270 million board feet of the 980 million board feet of timber to be offered for sale in region 1 was affected by appeals. Of that, 26 percent, or 70 million board feet of the timber sale volume appealed were salvage sales.

But, from the environmental community, I heard concerns about any attempt to stymie public participation or short-cut environmental documentation.

So, over the months following the hearings, with the help of Neil Sampson and his capable staff at American Forests, I worked closely with environmental, timber, and labor leaders for a balanced and equitable process which would allow public participation, but within a time frame sensitive to the rapid deterioration of timber in the forest. With this attempt to resolve the forest health issue in the 102d Congress, it was the first time in many years that leaders of the Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, the American Forests and Paper Association, and the Brotherhood of Carpenters, met in the same room together. And, while we were not completely successful, I am hopeful that through symposia and other similar forums, we will develop a solid solution.

As nothing more than an observer, I believe the environmental community had become muscle-bound as a result of 12 years of the Reagan/Bush administration. Members of conservation groups had developed much distrust and were afraid to move forward with virtually any public policy.

They had spent 12 years trying to prevent the erosion of past environmental accomplishments which had

been written into law, as they watched the executive branch move with its own agenda, which clearly did not mesh with theirs.

It was clear that when a legislative initiative such as mine was introduced, the first reaction of the conservation community was to pull back rather than to move forward, as their political agenda had become more defensive rather than offensive. The groups were acting independently instead of with one voice and coordination among groups had decayed.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, health problems on western forests are complex, have developed over decades, and many predict it will take decades to solve the problems. Both natural conditions and public opinion play a role in formation of new forest management policy, scientists will keep finding new ways to address these concerns, and public officials and decisionmakers should not be afraid to heed science and govern.

Inaction can be the worst enemy and is not a solution because options become reduced and human suffering and environmental damages continue to increase. As President Clinton stated at the Portland forest conference this spring, we cannot stop the process of change, but there is a need to manage that change so that both people and the land are given a fair chance. The job for Congress, the administration, and constituent groups is to recognize the convergence of forces in society and nature and work together for a solution.

□ 1420

PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some of my colleagues from the western public land States to talk a bit about some of the things that I think are unique to public land areas, management techniques that are unique to States that have from 50 to 85 percent of their State in Federal Government ownership. Most of those States, and there are 12 Western States west of the 100th meridian, have a special opportunity to use public lands in a multiple use way so that the resources there are used not only to the benefit of the country and all of us that own these public lands, but also for benefit of the States in which they are in and the economies.

Each of the States in this area have at least 25 percent of their lands in public ownership. The fact is that our States then become dependent on the activities, upon the decisions of land management managers for our future economy. Certainly no other State in

the country, the Eastern States, the Midwest States, could not put half their lands into single use recreational uses and expect to have a vibrant and growing economy in the future.

It is also true, I believe, that in order to fully use resources and use them wisely that multiple use is obviously the thing that we need to do. Farmers need irrigational water. Sawmill operators need logs, clearly. Miners have to explore and to develop. Recreationists need access for the kinds of things that they do.

In each of these uses there is a job and a tax base, and opportunities for people who live in small and medium-sized communities of the West.

Our States came into the Union in a different fashion than most of the others. They came in later, of course. My State of Wyoming came into the Union in the late 1890's. It came in much of a different way. The original 13 States, of course, had all their lands.

Texas came in with no public lands at all.

In the Midwestern States, the lands were deeded to the States.

In the West generally the lands were put up for homestead, and those that were not taken were left as residual lands and have subsequently become Federal lands to be managed by the Federal Government.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, let me show a chart of my State of Wyoming which is hard to see, but my colleagues can see Yellowstone Park and these areas, Teton Park and other kinds of Federal monuments and parks that were withdrawn for a single purpose, and that is an excellent thing to do. The green areas were set aside as reserved lands for forest reserves, a portion of which, a large portion of which, by the way, are in wilderness and are used basically for single purposes. This happens to be an Indian reservation which, of course, is also uniquely used. It is difficult to see the yellow portion, but those are Federal lands that are intermingled with private land. Right along the railroad, in order to develop the West, the Government gave every other section to the railroad in order to come through our States, and many are the same way. The alternate sections are private lands. This is basically the ownership pattern in many of the lands and our State, just alternating sections being private, BLM managed, and those others in Federal ownership. It makes it very difficult to manage those lands separately, almost impossible as a matter of fact.

I say to my colleagues, "If you were to segregate them, they would have to be fenced, and, frankly, the forage value of these lands would not be worth the fencing. So, you have to find some way to integrate both the Federal lands and the public lands in terms of management."

So, we looked to multiple use. We looked to grazing and oil and mining and timber and all those kinds of things, and some of my associates are here today to talk about some of those areas, and they are, of course, peculiar to different States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER]. He is from northern California where timber and Federal forests are of prime importance.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during this special order for the purpose of speaking on the importance of the timber industry to the citizens of this great Nation. First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, for organizing this special order on natural resource issues.

Mr. Speaker, the timber industry is vitally important to our Nation in a number of ways. Renewable wood products are used by every American in countless ways in their daily lives, and our domestic timber industry has provided this Nation with an affordable supply of wood products for generations. Most notably, it is the dream of virtually every American to someday be able to afford a home.

The timber industry also provides the economic livelihood for many families and whole communities throughout rural America. In many areas of the Nation, including my northern California district, logging has become more than just a job, but is in fact a unique way of life with its own storied traditions. Most importantly, the people who work in the timber industry care deeply about the forests in which they live.

In recent years, the timber industry and the multiple use concept of management employed in our forests have come under attack. Extreme preservationist groups spend over \$900 million a year to orchestrate a propaganda campaign which claims that the timber industry is about to cut down the last remaining trees in our national forests. Sometimes they claim that only 10 percent of the older trees remain, sometimes the figure they use is 5 percent—apparently they are never really sure. Whatever figure they use, nothing could be further from the truth.

My colleagues will be interested to know that there are more trees in America's forests today than there were 70 years ago. In California, depending on the specific national forest, anywhere from 75 to 90 percent of our national forests are completely off limits to timber harvesting. These forests are set aside in wilderness preserves and other nontimber management designations that ensure that they are protected for future generations. The remaining 10 to 25 percent of land that is available to timber management is managed for wildlife, fire protection, and other environmental values in ad-

dition to wood products production. Of course, forest lands which are harvested are required by law to be fully reforested.

To further elaborate on this point, it is significant to point out that in 1984, standing inventory of forests suitable for timber management in California was 148 billion board feet. In 1992, after harvesting 1.6 billion board feet annually, and after the fire sieges of 1987 and 1989, standing inventory of timber increased by 5 billion board feet. Moreover, most national forest throughout California project no significant reduction in old-growth forests over the next five decades under current management procedures.

Despite these facts which indicate that our forests are being managed responsibly, we have seen a drastic decline in timber production on Federal lands in recent years. This is having a devastating economic impact on the people of our rural, timber-dependent communities. In the past few years in California, 42 mills have closed and thousands of jobs have been sacrificed because the Federal Government has pursued a timber policy based on the extreme premise that our forests are disappearing. Just this weekend, I was in McCloud, a small timber-dependent community at the foot of beautiful Mt. Shasta in northern California. I talked personally with fourth and fifth generation loggers who cannot find work anywhere in the area. They are being forced to look for employment out of State, and therefore are being separated from families with school-aged children. This is a needless tragedy.

These policies affect more than just those who depend directly on the timber industry for their livelihood. Middle-class Americans in cities throughout the Nation are already being priced out of the home market. We have already seen lumber prices nearly double between October and March, causing an estimated \$4,600 increase in the price of an average size home. It has been estimated that an increase of this magnitude would reduce the number of households who could qualify for a mortgage on a median-priced home by about 2.8 million. With U.S. demand for wood and paper products expected to double by the year 2000, this situation will only get worse, thus impacting more and more Americans by dashing the dream of homeownership. If we are to avoid this scenario, we must develop a rational Federal timber policy that balances our need for renewable wood products with environmental concerns.

Mr. Speaker, we just had our fourth annual legislative woods tour in my district. This is an opportunity for legislators to spend a weekend in the scenic forests of northern California and get a first-hand look at on-the-ground, professional forest management. Over a dozen of our colleagues have attended this event over the past several years,

and have seen for themselves the real story of how our forests are being managed. I would like to invite each and every one of my colleagues in the House to take advantage of this opportunity in future years.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Clinton administration and my colleagues in the House to develop a balanced, multiple-use timber policy which sustains timber-dependent communities and provides affordable wood products to all Americans.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I was in Wyoming last week and met with the Society of Professional Foresters, and there has been a great deal of concern, of course, about below-cost timber sales and that kind of business, but these fellows mentioned the fact that, in order to manage a stand of timber one has to have some kind of cutting program.

Does that square with the gentleman's timber growers in his area?

□ 1440

Mr. HERGER. It does square. As a matter of fact, the gentleman might be interested to know that of all the federal programs that we have, to my knowledge the timber program is the only Federal program that actually returns a profit to the coffers of the United States, and therefore limits the amount of taxes that are required.

Our area is one of the most productive timber producing districts in the Nation. We grow far more timber than we are able to harvest. As the gentleman mentioned, when we see these overprotective policies that are inflicted upon us, that lock up our forests—and as I mentioned earlier, right now between only 10 to 15 percent of our total forests are available, at least in California—what that does is drive the cost of producing timber up, for maintaining the roads, fighting the fires, and paying out to our local schools, which 25 percent goes to, and maintaining roads.

What is being done by the extremists in the environmental community, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is alluding to, is they are forcing even these productive forests that are turning a profit for the Federal Government to actually become low cost sales, and I believe that is one further tragedy.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. We have talked, of course, about multiple use, and multiple use is what we seek to do, a balanced utilization in a reasonable way of the resources. Clearly recreation, clearly being able to commune with nature, is one of the uses as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Public Parks and Public Lands.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Wyoming yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the people in America years ago decided that they should have something to designate as wilderness. They looked at the beautiful West that was still publicly owned, and Congress came up with a designation of the term "wilderness" in 1964.

Now, it was kind of a difficult thing to come up with, because they wanted to take an area that was different from all of the rest of America. This is not where the roads are, this is not where the people are, this is another area.

So for the first time they put a legal definition on the term "wilderness." They put it into three different agencies. One would be the Forest Service, one would be the Bureau of Land Management, and one would be the National Park System.

Out of that they determined that each one of those agencies would designate a plan, and they were given that assignment to do that in all of the States that have public lands.

So they looked at it and they said, "We have to determine within this area that we own what becomes wilderness that we should be working with."

Now, most people do not understand what is wilderness. In their youth they saw a lot of places that they went, and it said "the Jim Bridger Wilderness Area," or "The Marshall Wilderness Area," or some other wilderness area.

However, my friends, please keep in mind that now we have changed it and we have an absolute definite definition of wilderness.

I would like to read this to you, because as I have talked around America and on this Hill, I have asked a number of people, "What is wilderness?" And most people give an ambiguous answer. They do not really have that worked out.

Here is what it says in the law and this is what we live by in the United States. "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his work dominate every landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the Earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man; where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean an area of undeveloped Federal land, retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions."

It also goes on to say there will be no roads in wilderness. It goes on to say that each one of these tracts of land will be at least 5,000 acres. And it talks about the certain areas that we look at as wilderness.

Now, if you want to be very candid about it, there is not too much in America that fits that definition. As a private pilot I enjoy flying over the places of the West. It is very, very difficult to fly over the States of Wyo-

oming, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, or Montana, without seeing two tracks. And if you go through the dicta of the wilderness bill as it fell out, you will find that one of the designations of a road is just two tracks. That is what constitutes a road.

So if you are really going to find wilderness, it is really hard to find 5,000 acres that does not have a cattle pond on it, does not have a fence on it, does not have a road on it, that there is not some definition that man was there.

Wilderness, as described by this Congress, they said, "You are the first man God put on this Earth and you walked in there and you saw this area that shows nothing, no sign of man." And that is what we are basically looking at.

Back to the three areas: one is Forest Service, one is BLM, and one is Park Service.

When I first came to this Congress in the election of 1980, I remember working for 4 years in Utah on a wilderness bill on the part of the Forest Service.

In 1984, I went to the White House with Senator Jake Garn and we in effect saw President Reagan sign this bill into law, which was a bill designating some 780,000 acres of wilderness in the State of Utah.

The single largest part of that is called the Uinta Mountains, which is the only mountain chain in America that runs from east to west. It is a beautiful, pristine area. Man has not been there. In fact, in the early thirties Congress said it was a primitive area. There is no sign of man, except a tin can or two that some camper happens to leave in there. There are just trails, and it is an absolutely gorgeous, beautiful place that most Americans have not seen.

That qualifies as the single biggest piece of wilderness there is in the lower 48. That qualifies as wilderness.

Now, who gets snookered in this process? As we sit there as westerners who are doing this today, we find a very big difference between the philosophy of our friends from the East, who want to come out West and say, "We want to enjoy this great wilderness area. It is ours just as much as it is yours."

Admittedly so. It is Federal ground. I think you should go back, however, and study your history and find out how you got your ground.

In the State of Oklahoma they lined them all off, somebody shot off a gun, and they all ran out and took the ground.

Now, I think that this article of the Constitution and other places make it very common and very common knowledge to most of us that the States should administer the ground themselves, and, very candidly, I do not know if the Federal Government does have a role in it.

However, because we did not do that in the West, now we have people from

the State of New York and the State of Massachusetts and other States telling us how to administer the ground that we are on.

Are we good stewards of the ground? Yes, we are good stewards of the ground. We take good care of it. We are very conscious of what it is, and we want to keep it primeval and pretty and beautiful as it was before.

The person that really gets snookered in this wilderness designation is the person like myself who has a family who likes to camp, fish, hunt, and go out into the wilderness area.

I will never forget the number of calls we got after passing the 1984 wilderness bill. The first thing that happened, people called up and they said, "Congressman, we can hardly wait to get into those wilderness areas with our recreational vehicles."

What they do not realize is they will never put a tire mark down in a wilderness area, because vehicles are not allowed in wilderness areas. The only way they are going to go in there is on their two feet or on a horse. There is no other way to go in there. Mechanical things are not allowed. Up until a year or so ago, when we passed the Americans With Disabilities Act, there was nothing that could go in.

If you are a deer hunter, you folks from the West who love to hunt deer, many people have devised this little thing that has a bicycle wheel on it and a couple of bars and a handle and a piece of leather or canvas in the middle, and when they shoot their deer they put it on and roll it out. That is a mechanized device, and technically they cannot use that.

If you happen to be one of those youngsters who unfortunately was hurt in Vietnam or Korea or somewhere and you are stuck in a wheelchair, technically before the Americans With Disabilities Act you could not go into a wilderness area. After the ADA Act, a group of us—and I sponsored that amendment—said it was all right for a wheelchair to go into a wilderness area.

I found it very interesting, because one day I was in Ogden, UT, and a young man came up to me in a wheelchair. And he said, "Congressman HANSEN, why don't I have the opportunity to go into the North Slope of the Uinta Mountains?" He said, "I used to go in with my uncles and my dad and my brothers," and that was before he went to Vietnam and lost his legs.

Here this young man can play basketball, he can play tennis, he road races, he goes all over America in a wheelchair, and he said, "I am not stuck in this seat. I can do it, just give me the opportunity."

But I do not think Americans realize that we had prohibited this person in a wheelchair from going into a wilderness area, just like we prohibit the man who is in a truck, just like we prohibit the veteran who wants to go in to

take care of something. We prohibit all these people from going in.

So, America, when you think that you can go into a wilderness area in your new four-wheel drive, forget it.

□ 1450

If you think you can take any mechanized vehicle in, forget it. And if you think you are big enough and strong enough to pack a 270 and 40 pounds on your back and walk 14 miles in and shoot a mule deer or something or an elk or a moose and bring it out, you might as well forget that, too, because there is no way you are going to get in.

What I am saying, in effect, is, there is very little ground in the West that really qualifies as wilderness. And many of us in the West respectfully say to our colleagues from the East, would you please follow your own law and do not give us these kind of wilderness bills that go right over the top of class C roads, class B roads, go right over the top of the cattle ponds, roads and things that do not fit the definition of wilderness. We would appreciate it very much if you would take that into consideration.

Now, as we start on the bills that are coming in the 103d session of Congress, we see many pieces of legislation that will come into the West and restructure the way we do business. Let me just ask some folks here, what is wrong, if we do it carefully, to cut down a few trees in the West and keep some of the lumber industry alive? The Forest Service and the BLM carefully go out, and they look at each tree. They understand what can be cut, which adds to calving production of elks, which adds to a lot of wildlife, and go in and cut it.

However, many of the extreme groups appeal it every time. And right now in the little State of Utah, we have lost the Kaibab Industries. We have lost the Escalante Sawmills. And in effect, we might as well turn off the lights in southern Utah. What is wrong with a few white-faced cows being able to graze, if it is done very carefully, to let them have the opportunity to control the grass?

The best range management people tell us this. Grazing on the ground is a tool to control it. If you do not do that, when the hot months of August and September come along, what do you have? You have a burn that will make Yellowstone look like nothing.

So we use that as a tool to keep down the grasses in that particular area. I can see nothing wrong with that either.

So, my colleagues, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and take a few minutes and talk to you about the designation of wilderness, and I would hope that some of our friends from the East who were given their States would take something into consideration for those of us who have to have grazing,

who have to get into lumber, who have to get into mining and have to live on the public grounds. We could really go back to the Constitution and, in effect, give us back the property, much like the States in the East had it. I am sure we could administer it better than the Federal Government does.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

We are talking about multiple use. We are talking about using the resources for a number of uses, such as wilderness, such as grazing, such as oil and gas, water use and development, mining, and, of course, sportsmen and wildlife and hunters.

So this is what we are seeking to do, is to create a situation where there is dependability on multiple use so that communities in the West can be built and tax bases and jobs can be built around these public lands.

One very important area is that of mining. Mining, of course, is notorious for being in the West and being in the mountains, and the hardrock mining of various kinds is still a very prevalent and important activity in many of the Western States.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my associate, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], who is the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wyoming for yielding to me so that I may make some brief remarks about public lands mining of the so-called hardrock minerals. Mr. Speaker, by this I mean those mineral commodities for which the right to explore the public domain and mine one's discoveries is granted under the 1872 mining law.

Now that sounds like a long time for a law to exist, but like the Constitution it has seen many amendments over the years and plenty of case law has been handed down defining the administration of the act in a modern context. Nevertheless, there are many who seek to repeal this law and substitute a system whereby the Federal land managing agency could simply say "No" to proposals to explore, develop or extract hardrock minerals no matter how environmentally sound the remediation plan, or how large a bond would be held to insure reclamation.

Mr. Speaker, the rural communities in Nevada and elsewhere in the West rely upon access to the resources of the public lands in order to survive, and occasionally prosper. Mining is no different than ranching, timbering, oil and gas drilling, and commercial recreational uses such as river running or guided hunting. These industries need certainty regarding the rules for use of the resource or the investment necessary to carry on the trade will simply not be made.

Some advocates for reform of the mining law would be pleased if pros-

pectors and miners left the public lands altogether. Indeed, there is already an exodus of exploration and development capital to Latin American nations because many of those countries have reformed their laws to lure mining ventures not shun them. For example, Mexico revised its laws to delete the imposition of a 7-percent gross royalty on hardrock mineral production to acknowledge its desire for foreign investment in its mineral economy. At the same time, Mexico raised the rental fees due from mining concessions to spur development of the already leased lands.

Mr. Speaker, our country should do the same. We have taken the first step by requiring the payment of annual fees by holders of unpatented mining claims on the public lands in lieu of the obligation to perform assessment work on those claims. I do support relief for small businessmen and women in this regard, but corporate entities will all have to pay annually to keep their claims for the following year.

However, with respect to imposing a royalty on hardrock mining, the administration is going the opposite direction from the rest of the world. President Clinton first sought a 12.5-percent gross revenues royalty, then backed off from putting it in the budget package. Nevertheless, the administration appears to remain committed to a gross royalty—which is, of course, a tax levied irrespective of profitability. Secretary Babbitt has testified that a net-based royalty could lead to temptations to cook the books in attempts to cheat the Treasury. Mr. Speaker, we have a bureaucracy already in place to stop such nonsense. It's called the IRS.

But let us examine just how well off miners are as a group. Could they pay an additional 8 or 12.5 percent of their revenues right off the top? I have here a graph depicting the return on shareholders, equity as reported by Business Week magazine last March. As we have heard from the White House, the most profitable industry sector is health care, which is far out ahead of telecommunications in second place for 1992. The metals and mining sector as a whole—no pun intended—bring up the rear. Shareholders in this industry, as well as for autos, saw a negative return on their invested dollars.

Now, to be fair, I want to point out that this group has both public and private land components. But, I want to highlight the precious metals subsector, which is concentrated in the west and have a heavy involvement in the public lands. Mr. Speaker, the mining game for the last decade has been in gold prospecting and mining and that's what would be impacted by radical reform of the 1872 Act. This subsector eked out a return on equity of just 2.9 percent last year. An investor in pharmaceuticals would have made eight times more money than a miner!

To be sure, returns vary from year to year and indeed, 1992 was a bad year for metals prices, but not as bad as 1991 when the precious metals sector was in the red. My point is the mining business must live with volatile prices for its products. To levy a new tax on the public lands segment of that industry, based not on ability to pay, but rather on gross revenues, is to chase off any further investment in hardrock mining of the public lands.

However, I want to alert my colleagues that I have accepted the need for a net-based royalty on hardrock miners. We have such a net proceeds of mines tax in Nevada which has worked well since 1865. In times of high metals prices the Treasury reaps the benefits of additional profitability of our mines, but when prices are squeezing margins the tax doesn't cause the mines to shut down. I think its the only way to go. If the gross royalty advocates win on this issue we will see few, if any, lower-graded deposits mined because of the regressive nature of this tax. Instead, miners will be thrown out of work, from high-paying jobs generally including health benefits, into low-paying service sector jobs—if they can find them—or for the lucky ones, employment in Mexico, Chile, Peru, or the Pacific rim.

But, that's not the half of it. As important as the royalty question is in the reform debate, it is merely the easiest to quantify. In my view, the real battle shaping up for a future conference with the other body is over the so-called right to mine. As I said a few minutes ago, any industry needs to know what the rules are going to be before investment is made, yet the radical reformers insist the current law give miners special protection and entitlements that shortchange other public lands users.

It's a myth, Mr. Chairman. Public lands miners must follow all the Federal and State environmental laws or the myriad permits necessary to mine will be denied or withdrawn. However, when and if a prospective miner can demonstrate compliance with these existing laws then, yes, the land managers have no discretion to deny the operations approval. This really bothers the folks out to protect any and all viewsheds from scenic degradation, but it is absolutely necessary if we expect reasonable people to invest their hard-earned cash in a mining venture.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, there is already a well-used process for setting aside public lands deemed to be so valuable for scenic or other purposes that mining should not be allowed. Its called withdrawal legislation and we use it nearly every week in this Chamber. The National Parks, Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee has a seemingly endless parade of bills on the suspension calendar, and even a few that go get a rule for debate and amendment—imagine that.

My colleagues, I have sponsored or cosponsored a few of those withdrawal bills myself because I think its how we should do business. Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution states: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States." I, for one, believe it would be ill-advised to hand such authority to the unelected local forest ranger or BLM manager to decide who can mine and who can not on the basis of mere whim or prodding from special interest groups.

No, Mr. Speaker, we need to tinker with the working of the mining law, but we must not repeal today's environmentally conditioned right to mine unless our true goal is to send mining investment—and the jobs that go with it—to a safe haven overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the chart to which I referred.

Industry profitability comparisons—major U.S. industries, 1992

	Percent return on equity
Health care	23.4
Telecommunications	15
Service industries	14.7
Leisure industries	14.1
Banks	12.6
Utilities	10.7
Weighted average	10
Manufacturing	9.8
Chemicals	6.4
U.S. precious metals ¹	2.9
Automotive	-3.3
Metals and mining	-4.8

¹ Data provided by Nevada Mining Association.

□ 1500

I want to thank the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] for yielding to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada. Certainly there are a number of needs and a number of uses that come from public lands that are national uses, that do not simply lie to those who are most adjacent to the lands. One of them is the mines and products of the mines. Another, of course, is oil and petroleum.

One of the difficulties we have now with our balance of trade is the import of oil. Public lands fall in this category, again, of having access for exploration, being able to use these lands for that multiple use as well.

I yield to my associate, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], to talk a little bit about the role of oil and gas on public lands.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, in securing this time to address the issue of multiple use on public lands. As a Member from a district which has a substantial amount of public land, I have continually tried to

present the full and true story to eastern Members about the unique situation of public lands States. Whether it concerns oil and gas production, grazing, mining, or increasing the number of acres for wilderness and Park Service lands, these issues will always be very controversial in Western States.

It seems that we repeat this drill every year, where Members from Western States must fight for the right to express the importance of providing fair and equitable solutions to these issues. This is especially difficult in the House of Representatives, whose Members come predominately from urban areas.

In addition to the grazing fee increase, mining law reform, and the controversy surrounding the spotted owl and the timber industry, other legislation affecting public lands has been introduced which would drastically affect my district. For example, in the 103d Congress, legislation is pending which would expand the National Park Service land, add buffer zones, and take private property from my constituents. Each of these bills is promoting a knockdown, drag out fight between my constituents and the Federal land management agencies.

Legislation is pending which would prevent oil and gas exploration next to Lechuguilla Cave, a world-renowned natural resource located near Carlsbad National Park. Over 60 miles of cave have been discovered so far, and yet this is estimated to be only 5 percent of its total mass. The farther this cave extends, the greater the potential for conflict due to the dangers associated with the infiltration of hydrocarbon gases, posing a safety problem to researchers and visitors.

Rest assured that I, too, want to protect this natural resource, as well as the researchers and visitors in the caves. However, I do want to make sure that oil producers and their constitutional rights are protected. If an active lease is affected, we must provide the fair market value compensation for the taking of that lease. I believe this should include the value at which the potential reserve is valued. Oil and gas producers spend millions of dollars developing the appropriate infrastructure, and many years of expertise are required before leases are acquired from the Federal Government.

Also pending in Congress is a proposal to link Carlsbad National Monument with the Guadalupe Park in Texas. The land is currently designated as wilderness study area and is administered by the BLM and Forest Service, which continues to apply the multiple-use philosophy. This new legislation would take the land out of multiple-use and give it to the National Park Service. If this were to happen, public access, hunting, off-road vehicle use, grazing, energy development, and a number of other interests would be severely restricted.

In both the Lechuguilla Cave Protection Act and the Carlsbad expansion bill, the National Park Service would substantially increase the cost of management while limiting production and the circulation of tax dollars in the local communities for roads and school systems. If the Federal Government continues to make it tougher for extractive industries to make a living, the land will go unleased. This in turn is bad for the Federal Government, which needs these revenues to run many of its agencies' land management programs.

It is important that we make sure that the Federal land management agencies provide stability and continuity for these industries and the local communities which depend on Federal lands. The fees derived from public lands are an integral part of the revenues needed to operate our school systems in rural areas. I believe that Members from Western States, Republican or Democrat, must work harder and harder to make the Clinton administration, our committee chairmen, and our city cousins understand that the multiple-use philosophy works, and a large percentage of the fees derived from these uses is returned back to local communities.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] for giving this issue the heightened awareness that it deserves. I look forward to working with him and the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee to protect the most endangered species of all: The public lands States.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. We have been talking about public lands and multiple use. We have talked about the use of oil and oil and gas resources. We have talked about wilderness, setting it aside for particular uses there. We have talked about timber, the harvesting of that resource, that renewable resource that sustains itself. We have talked about mining.

Let me just say that in terms of mining, that there are very strict reclamation laws, both on the State and national level, to put these lands back as they were. I want to talk just a second about another one that I think is very important, and that, of course, is wildlife hunting and fishing.

One of the peculiarities of public lands and the land patterns of ownership in the West is that they are intermingled with private lands and public lands. For the most part, the private lands were taken up in homestead, so naturally the people who took them up homesteaded along the streams, homesteaded in the lower valleys, homesteaded where the most fertile land was. Then they used this as base land, now lease the surrounding public lands, which for the most part are much less productive.

My point is that in order to sustain wildlife, we have to use the private lands and the private water and the private winter feed as well as the summer feed in order to make this project work, and it has indeed worked.

Very briefly, let me show the Members the wildlife increases on public lands, taken from the public land statistics. In 1966, in the antelope category, we had 139,000, roughly; in 1990, 295,000, an increase of 112 percent of antelope on public and private lands; bighorn sheep, even more, a 435-percent increase in bighorn sheep; deer, a 30-percent increase from 1.1 to 1.4 million; elk, a 782-percent increase, from 18,000 to 142,000; and moose, 475 percent.

Therefore, it is compatible and indeed necessary to use the private lands in conjunction with the public lands for livestock to feed in the summer, for wildlife to feed in the winter.

One of the other vital elements, these lands are all very low rainfall lands. These are droughty lands, and water is an essential element not only to human activities but, of course, if anything is going to be green you have to spread some water on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] to talk a little bit about water and water development on public lands.

□ 1510

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman for holding what I think is a very important special order on the use of our public lands and the issue of water development. I am sorry I was not here to hear the entire special order. I heard the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] talking about the concept of multiple use and multiple use is an important concept that has served the public interest extremely well and is now under attack. And it is not under attack overtly, shall we say, but it is very much under attack by efforts to further clamp down on and restrict the kinds of activities that can occur on the public lands.

I would like to just briefly mention that there is a movement to liberate the public lands from cattle grazing. They had the phrase, "cattle free by '93," and I guess they will have to come up with a new one for 1994 and 1995. But I have no doubt but what that effort will continue to be waged.

There have been efforts to try and restrict public lands from mining activities. We know very well the efforts in the Pacific Northwest with the northern spotted owl. I call that a phony issue, and I will say it here again on the floor of the House. The spotted owl is really not the issue. It is simply a vehicle in order to eliminate the logging from the public lands, and the thinkers and the writers in this movement to advance the use of the spotted owl as a tool to stop logging. They ac-

tually refer to it as a surrogate species meaning that it is a surrogate for actually the real intent which is to eliminate logging.

So we have all of these efforts going on, and then there is an effort against agriculture, and that is a two-pronged effort. One is to heighten public fears concerning food safety. And we have seen various attempts at that with alar and the alar scare in California a few years ago, and we will continue to see those efforts waged in terms of the use of chemicals, pesticides and herbicides and so forth. And when those cannot succeed, there will be the second prong, and that is to begin to restrict the availability of water. And we see this being carried out.

It was carried out here in the Congress, agreed to by the President last year where we had a water project bill that was passed that in California may have helped other States, other colleagues that are generally supportive and right-thinking on issues. But in this case, they joined together to produce I think a very sad result in the State of California where we have a longstanding water project.

I am sure many are aware that California has sort of unusual if not unique topography, and we have massive amounts of water in one end of the State and the bulk of the population in the other end of the State. Even so, the process of engineering projects and so forth over a number of years has made available this vast supply of water in the north to points south. And the Central Valley project is one of those projects developed really to enable agriculture to obtain the water that it needed and, of course, the water that is impounded by the dams is available for us. Otherwise, it simply flows out to the sea.

The Central Valley project has a yield of about 7 million acre-feet of water a year. We just passed last year a bill that took about 1½ million acre-feet of that 7 million and directed that it be used for nonagricultural purposes, basically to be flushed through the delta, which then leads to the San Francisco Bay and the convergence of the San Joaquin and the Sacramento Rivers, two of the State's major rivers. I mention this because California has soared tremendously in population. I think we had about a 25-percent population increase in the last years, and we are projected in the region of the State I represent in northern California, the Sacramento area, to have about a 33-percent population increase, about a one-third increase in our region.

We actually have, oddly enough, a federally authorized project. Construction was commenced in the 1960's, and we have 300 million dollars' worth of footing work that has been performed there. Yet we cannot, have not been

able to build on that to this point because we are caught up in this controversy of whether we build more dams. The issue seems to be portrayed that the construction of a dam is somehow antithetical or contrary to the environmental interests, and yet in this very case the construction of that particular dam, and I would submit in many cases I would believe, at least in this one, we would enhance all of the environmental uses in the region. This dam would ensure that there is enough water flow in the lower American River Parkway, a unique recreational resource in the State, a river flowing through the urban areas which is heavily utilized by rafters in the lower American River and by those walking alongside it to ensure the natural beauty. So fish are being killed right now, or they were for the 6-year drought that we had when the water levels dropped so low and the water became too warm for the fish and they died as a result. And any time when we have less than the normal supply of water, they will continue to die.

The reservoir at Folsom Lake was the most heavily utilized federally owned, State-managed recreation area in the State until the drought and the lake level dropped. And our county in San Joaquin County is heavily dependent on groundwater. They were induced by the Federal Government not to develop this additional source of water, but to defer that, and to become part of the Auburn Dam project. So the result has been that we have steadily been overpumping the groundwater, in many cases permanently damaging the aquifer because we do not have enough surface water.

So here is an example of where water development would actually enhance all of these environmental uses from fisheries to maintenance of the flows in the lower American, to recreation on the lower American and at the Folsom Lake, and of course, one of the most important environmental considerations in terms of quality of life for people is having an adequate supply of drinking water and water available for domestic and municipal uses, as this particular dam would surely do.

So I for one join in this special order just to add my belief that we have got to put people first. I think that was one of President Clinton's campaign themes, putting people first. We have to be good stewards of that which God has given us, including the land, and the water, and the air, and the resources, but we have to recognize that we need an intelligent, balanced, multiple-use approach which recognizes the priority of human beings over other concerns, while respecting those other concerns as we develop our policies so as not to damage or destroy them.

In the case of this particular dam, the water development actually fur-

thers every interest, environmental as well as nonenvironmental, and it is my belief that we are going to have to develop more water in the West, which is a naturally arid region, if we are to continue our progress. And I am not asking, by the way, nor am I advocating or even indicating I would support the idea that somehow we do this at Federal taxpayer expense.

□ 1520

I think the Reagan administration was right to suggest that these are areas of concern that are appropriate for State and local action, but obviously where the Federal Government has so much land and where the policies come in, it has to be a willing partner where we develop these resources, I think it is very important for the Nation, as we move ahead in these areas.

I thank the gentleman from Wyoming for the opportunity to discuss some of these issues.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out a particularly important area.

We do live in a dry area. We have, I guess, in Wyoming about 14 inches of annual precipitation. Someone there said that when the Lord had it rain 40 days and 40 nights, we got an inch-and-a-half.

So you have to have some kind of multiple-use program. We talked about that.

Let me comment on one area, and that is grazing. Obviously grazing is a major interest and concern in the West. I have already talked about the land patterns where you have to put together the private and the Federal lands in order to have units that work out very well.

Let me just make a couple of points about it. One is that we hear a lot about deterioration of the range. In my view, there is very little connection between the rate paid on grazing fees and the condition of the range. Those two things are separate issues, and you can argue about them separately.

But you manage the range on the one hand, and you charge for it on the other.

The other difficult part, you know, it blends its way all the way through this that we have been talking about, that it is difficult for people in the East to have quite a different thing. They have lots of water. They have no public lands to really understand the differences.

One of them is the difference in the value of forage in an acre of land in Wyoming and one that you might lease in Maryland. It is not unusual in some of those ranges to have 30 acres per cow, per calf unit, because it is not productive land. It takes a long-legged cow to be able to keep on the move to get enough to eat sometimes.

So these are the kinds of things we have to deal with. And, of course, in recent years when every year we go through this annual ritual of trying to decide what the price ought to be and the certainty goes away, it is very difficult to keep available the value of the base land.

So I want to thank my colleagues for the contributions they have made in the various areas of multiple use. I think it is a terribly important issue that we need to come to grips with, and we do it every year.

We have tried to make the point that decisions made about our Federal land resources go far beyond the boundaries of national parks and forests, monuments and refuges. They affect tax base, they affect schools, they affect jobs, they affect small communities and towns and businesses and banks, and it is important to manage these lands for their resources, but also for the multiple-use kind of returning renewable resources that are there.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and the opportunity.

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS REDUCTION PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today a number of us would like to talk about a very relevant subject. Most of the people in our audience may or may not know that the \$1.5 trillion budget is put together by 13 budget bills, 13 bills that go through 13 appropriations subcommittees and come forth then in this body at the end as one full appropriations bill.

We are beginning that process now, and tomorrow the first of those committees will be reporting the legislative branch, the branch that oversees Congress, almost \$2 billion of cost. I serve on that subcommittee and on the Committee on Appropriations and would like to tell briefly what we are trying to do.

We have offered up through the process a recommendation for cuts of up to 25 percent. Now, the cuts will be surgical cuts, not across-the-board cuts. They will be cuts where we have tried to think through what we are doing with those cuts and how it impacts this body.

We all know that it is imperative that cuts be made. I have sat in this House, now my second term, and I have watched while major corporations have reduced their employment and reduced jobs in my district and all over this country because they have had to cut costs, but government has not cut.

I have looked at small business that has had to take steps to cut their employees, to cut expenses because of the onerous numbers of regulations and additional costs they are having to face

while government has cut almost none at all. I have watched throughout small communities local governments having to struggle with cuts while they are being forced to accept more and more mandates from the Federal Government and pick up the costs from those mandates.

The President ran a year ago on the basis of change, and many people interpreted that statement of change as being one where we would now come and ask major government, the Federal Government, the Federal bureaucracy, to start contracting, and for government to make changes and make cuts. That has not been the case so far. The packages that have come before us, the so-called jobs bill, presented \$16 billion of additional spending to this body with no revenue covering it.

The Senate wisely took out over \$12 billion of those spending increases. The tax package that came through offered some cuts, but it was primarily a tax-increase bill, and even during the talks of compromise in the Senate now on that legislation, the tax increases are still going to be four or five to one, and the cuts will still be put toward the end of the President's term, and we know what that means. They rarely ever happen.

So we must today make change, make time for that change, and address these budget bills one by one as they come before us in the next 6 weeks.

We are starting with the legislative-branch subcommittee. It is important for us to start there, not because it has the most money, not because it will make the most impact on the deficit, but, ladies and gentlemen, it sets the standard for the other areas of government, sets the standard because the legislative branch will be watched. If we make significant cuts, if we look toward reforming government and cutting our budget, then we will set the standard for the other 12 subcommittees and the other larger branches of government that will, indeed, give us the billions of dollars of savings that are going to be necessary.

We are recommending a 25-percent cut. It is a sizable cut, certainly, but it is not one without background.

Several people will speak today and will address different segments of that cut.

But what we have tried to do and what we have proposed to the subcommittee was that we need to really change in this Government. We need to look forward. We have numerous duplicative agencies, branches, committees, organizations. We have, for instance, if one wants information in taxation and economic matters, one can go to the CRS that has 875 employees, one can go to the Congressional Budget Office that has hundreds of employees, one can go to the Government Accounting Office and ask for a study that has thousands of employees, one can go to the Joint

Economic Committee and ask for a study, one can go to the staff on the Committee on the Budget and ask for that, one can go to the staff on the Committee on Ways and Means and ask for that one, one can go to the Senate Finance Committee for their staff and ask for that, one can go to the Committee on the Budget in the Senate and ask for that, one can go to the Office of Management and Budget on the administrative side with its thousands of employees and get responses in each of those areas.

Now, while there are people with expertise in all of these branches, they duplicate, and they cost hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. And, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot afford that duplication today when we are asking millions of people across this country to sacrifice.

And so we are recommending a consolidation of those forces. We are making a recommendation of a consolidation of the legal staff, the plethora of attorneys that represent committees and subcommittees and various branches of the Government. We are asking that we look toward a pool in that area that will give us adequate legal advice but not the numbers and the costs that we now have.

□ 1530

In many ways we are trying to put together cuts. We will be talking about some of those as they affect the legislative branch appropriations which will yield us a 25-percent cut that will then give us a chance to go to all of the other 12 subcommittees and say, "This branch has sacrificed. It is now time for you to sacrifice also." Then I think we can gain the budget confidence to make real budget reductions in this House of Representatives and in this Congress.

That is essential, I think, because we only have a few years to attack this problem and to bring about those cuts.

I yield at this time, Mr. Speaker, to an outstanding Member of this body who has been leading in the area of cuts and who has just been before the Committee on Rules to get the rule and to plead for a rule for the debate tomorrow that will allow the amendment to place that 25-percent cut on the floor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much and commend my colleague for the leadership he has shown on this important subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible for us to reduce Government spending. And certainly the gentleman has suggested the place that we ought to begin is cutting in the spending on Congress itself.

All of us receive a great deal of mail, telegrams, phone calls from our constituents. We go home and meet with them and ask what their concerns are and what they would like us to accomplish in Washington.

I dare say not a single Democrat nor a single Republican Representative in the House has ever been lobbied, caajoled, urged by any one of his constituents to spend more money on himself or herself, to spend more money on Congress and congressional staff. That just has not happened.

There is no lobby for this in America except Members of Congress themselves. Not every Member is a supporter or sponsor of increased and ever-growing congressional spending by itself, and yet because of inattention, because of lack of aggressiveness in trying to cut, we have been on autopilot. This spending has grown and grown and grown over the years.

Back when F.D.R. and Harry Truman won World War II, Congress declared war and won the victory and Harry Truman moved on to the Korean war, the number of committee employees in this Congress was 193. One hundred and ninety-three people got the job done back in 1947.

Since that time, committee staff has grown at a rate six times that of inflation. The legislative branch appropriations increased by 3,540 percent during that period.

At the same time, inflation was 569 percent; we had a 3,540-percent increase in the amount that Congress spends on itself.

There is no excuse for the fact that today, to take care of 535 Members of Congress, 435 in the House and another 100 in the Senate, we have over 31,000 staff employees. There is no excuse for the fact that it costs roughly \$2.4 billion to run the Congress of the United States, nearly \$2 billion to run the House itself.

There is just no excuse.

A big part of our congressional budget is devoted not only to committee staff but also to congressional agencies. That is, rivals to the executive branch departments, which under our system of separation of powers are set up to carry out the dictates of law; congressional agencies created to rival these departments, such as the Congressional Budget Office, such as the General Accounting Office.

Let us take a look at GAO's budget. In 1980 this one part of congressional staff cost \$204 million. By 1985 that had grown to \$299 million; in 1988 it was \$330 million; in 1989, \$346 million.

The average increase between 1980 and 1990 was 8 percent per year.

The next year, in 1991, we had a 14-percent increase. So that the total budget was \$409 million. Nineteen ninety-two, another 8-percent increase, \$443 million, virtually all of this for staff. In 1993 our budget was \$435 million, and we are going to hang right in around that number for fiscal year 1994 if things are not fixed, if things are not changed.

So part of our amendment would reduce the budget for this one part of our

congressional staff to one-third of a billion dollars per year. Now I am quite confident that this agency, which was begun in 1929 to look after, ironically, government waste, could do a fine job of it for one-third of a billion dollars per year.

That happens to be roughly the amount that Price Waterhouse spends on all of their outside audits for all of their private clients in a year.

Now Price Waterhouse has over 9,000 professionals and 110 offices. They could do this job for us, unquestionably, at much lower cost.

Much of what goes at GAO, General Accounting Office, is accomplished at the behest, sad to say, of committee Chairs, people in this Congress who know the results they want in advance and who in fact dictate that result to GAO; not so much because they control the way GAO puts the staff report together but because they control the design of the inquiry.

Back in 1969, not very long ago compared to the time that GAO has been operating—when it was founded in 1921—back in 1969, as recently as that year, only 10 percent of GAO's reports were initiated by Members of the Congress. By 1980 that had increased to more than a third of all the reports handled by GAO.

By 1985 more than half, 57 percent of all the reports that GAO, this watchdog agency that is supposed to be keeping an eye on things, did were dictated by this Congress. And in 1991 that number had risen to 80 percent.

So this is the result of increasing funding. We spend more money on staff and Congress in essence co-opts that staff and uses it as its own. This is not trimming government waste; it is itself a source of government waste, now about half a billion dollars when it could operate for one-third of a billion.

I would like to yield back to the gentleman additional time so that my colleague, so that he can discuss further why it is that we feel it is so important that President Clinton's campaign promise to cut 25 percent of the legislative branch spending be honored. It is going to require action by the House and by the Senate. The President cannot force this. We have got to do it ourselves. But it is vitally important that we cut away some of the fat in our own staffing here. We could do a much, much better job than we do of legislating if most Members paid attention to the laws we drafted, if you did not see this unseemly procedure so often when a bill comes to the floor of the House that nobody has had the opportunity to read, it is over a thousand pages, might be billions or hundreds of billions of dollars, all of this has been accomplished by staff members. They have no idea what they are voting on, and the American people are worse off for it.

We could improve the legislative product and process by cutting money

and saving money for the taxpayers. This is an opportunity not to be missed. Let us help President Clinton keep his campaign promise. I say let us get on with it.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman, Congressman COX. I appreciate the work that he has done and his insight. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], who has worked as a Member of the freshman class on cutting costs.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the entire issue of congressional reform is very important to all of us. As a freshman, as a new Member here, I joined with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and with Congresswoman TILLIE FOWLER of Florida we formed a Congressional Reform Task Force. We have been meeting almost on a weekly basis since the year began and talking about a number of issues.

We have a plan for 19 specific reforms of the way the House operates, as well as just today we released our plan for congressional campaign finance reform.

I want to focus on those areas, those parts of the freshman Republican reform package which directly contribute and support the gentleman from North Carolina's remarks about why we need to and why we should cut a total of 25 percent from legislative appropriations.

There are a number of areas that the Republican freshman task force recommended. First off, we also endorsed the 25-percent total reduction in committee budgets. We did not say that every committee had to have a 25-percent cut, as long as the cuts combined would equal 25 percent.

□ 1540

We wanted to show the American people that we know cuts have to be made. Cutting spending is more than just a slogan. We thought it was only fair and appropriate that the cuts start right here in the U.S. Congress. So we recommended a 25-percent total reduction in committee spending.

In addition to that, we recommended a 25-percent cut in the franking allowance, the account by which all Members send out free mail.

With that, we also wanted to ask for automatic disclosure of monthly franking reports. That is an amendment that we will be trying to propose to the appropriations bill tomorrow. We hope we receive the approval of the Rules Committee to offer that amendment, and to require that we think is very important as well.

We want to return any savings of the debt to the Treasury for reduction of the Federal debt.

Also importantly, we want to reduce the amount of money we spend on

former Speakers of the House. Right now that is a substantial amount of money that we spend, even after a Speaker of the House has retired 5, 10, 15 years later, we are still spending money on that individual, supposedly for him to complete his business.

We recommended 3 years. We understand that a compromise version of 5 years will be offered. We think as long as we can draw the line and say we are going to stop spending, that is the best thing to do.

But the freshmen Republicans stand committed to reductions in spending. We think those spending cuts have to spend here first.

Again I commend the gentleman from North Carolina for leading this effort, as well as all the other Members who have worked on it, because it really is a role where many Members have added their voices and their time.

Once again, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. This is an extremely important issue and the more the American people stand about it, I think the better off we are all going to be.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I appreciate the efforts the freshmen class has made. There are many Members from the freshmen class that were elected to come here to make change, real change, change that is going to be hard to do and it needs to start in this body and with the congressional budget, and I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE]. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] has been a fiscally conservative Member of this body for a number of years, but is especially interested in cutting this 25 percent, the cuts in the legislative body this year, as a real chance for us to make change in our budgeting process.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from western North Carolina for having yielded to me.

I say to the gentleman from North Carolina, I had not planned to participate in this special order. I just saw the gentleman on television. I came running over here because this is very much of interest to me.

I introduced a bill, and I am sure the gentleman is familiar with it, which I appropriately called the triple play bill, just on the eve of the opening of the baseball season.

I would like to touch on a couple of those and emphasize specifically where the gentleman from North Carolina is coming from as far as the legislative cutback is concerned.

My three-pronged bill addresses former Presidents' pensions, for one. It would change the eligibility of former Presidents to claim their pensions thusly:

Now as the gentleman knows, when a President leaves the White House, the next day he starts drawing his Presidential pension. I have provided a remedy to that. My bill would delay the eligibility of the President to claim that pension until he reaches, he or she reaches the prevailing Social Security age. I do not think that is unfair nor unreasonable.

Now, President Clinton if he were to serve one term would collect \$2.2 million from the time he left the White House until the time he reaches the prevailing Social Security age, clearly not right.

Another portion of my triple play bill addresses Secret Service protection to the former Presidents eternally. I can appreciate a transition period of perhaps a year, but at some point it seems to me that the former Presidents and their spouses ought to be able to blend into the woodwork without the benefit of Social Security Secret Service protection at the expense of taxpayers.

Finally, I say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] getting down to where the gentleman is today legislatively, I am concerned about the Speakers' benefits, the former Speakers who leave that podium, go into private life. They appear to become beneficiaries eternally of the Speaker's perks; that is, office supplies, office space, secretarial assistants. I think clearly this is abusive.

I am not blaming the former Speakers personally, but it is just another trap into which we fall around here and let the taxpayer worry about paying the fiddler when it comes time to pay the fiddler.

I think what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is directing toward this legislative expenditure package is well overdue. I commend the gentleman for having done it.

I think probably echoing what the gentleman has already said, because I have not been here on the floor from the outset, but I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina nor am I being unduly critical of the legislative branch.

We are not saying they have to dismantle and cease operating tomorrow. We are not suggesting that at all.

I think what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is saying is let us make some sort of parameters whereby we can all live reasonably.

Let us address a question finally, is it good for the public? Will it benefit Americans at large, or is it in some self-serving way only benefiting those of us in this Chamber? It is time that we direct attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina for having taken a lead role generally as a Member of this 103d Congress, and specifically as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I thank the gentleman for having yielded to me.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] has done in past years in fiscally responsibly moving toward cuts in the budget.

As the gentleman pointed out, we have all had to make sacrifices. Those of us who find our family budgets have to be cut, we have to sit back and set priorities and then go with the amount of money we have. Businesses we find have had to make those same cuts, and many times in communities it costs employees, it costs jobs, it costs the economy, but they have to do it to remain solvent.

Now, we are asking in this body today that we make the same cuts. The administration has come to the people of this country and said, "We want to cut Social Security benefits from Social Security recipients. We want to take that money, which is paid from employee withholding taxes, a special tax for the Social Security fund, we want to take those funds out of that special trust fund and over to the general fund to pay for more spending."

We are taxing Social Security benefits for that purpose, and you, the elderly, the administration is saying, should make that sacrifice.

They go on to say to Federal employees, "We want you to take COLA cuts, cost-of-living cuts. We want you to take the money, the retired money that you have to live on, we want to be able to cut that. We want you to make that sacrifice."

Those are significant sacrifices when you consider the overall budget of the average Social Security recipient or the average Federal retired employee.

Social Security recipients will be asked to pay on something around \$25,000 to \$30,000 in income, to pay a tax of 85 percent of their benefits.

We are also telling small business that we are going to in the tax package the administration passed through this House and is now over in the Senate, that we want to increase taxes on small business significantly, not to mention the number of regulations that are coming.

We said to the average person, middle class and lower income individuals, for that matter, "We want you to sacrifice and pay higher fuel taxes, gasoline taxes, Btu taxes and the like and everything else and all the inflation that follows the increase in those fuel taxes, we want you to sacrifice and make that sacrifice for this country."

Then we as a Congress report out a bill from the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations that says we do not think we ought to make any cuts. We will trim around the edge here. Some of us were successful in getting a few things through, but it is less than 1 percent that this body will be sacrificing, and when you really shake it out probably is not making any cuts in the legislative body.

What we are saying today is if you are going to ask the elderly to sacrifice, if you are going to ask the average individual to sacrifice and small business to sacrifice and Federal employees to sacrifice and everyone else to sacrifice, then we should make a meaningful cut in the legislative budget of nearly \$2 billion in order to send a message that we are sharing the sacrifice and that is what a lot of this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize other distinguished Members who have worked toward cutting. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has worked specifically trying to reduce spending in areas of former Speakers, and that amounts to several hundred thousand dollars, and it is hard to justify in the long term.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

□ 1550

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Carolina for yielding to me, and I very much appreciate his taking this time to make it clear that a very serious effort is, in fact, ongoing right now as we speak in the Committee on Rules to try and come up with innovative ways to cut our spending basically as it deals with the legislative appropriations bill; that is, the money we use to support the House of Representatives because it is in that area that we have had so much concern expressed from our constituents: Are we using the money wisely? Are we getting it on target? Is there redundancy? Are we spending it on the very highest priorities when there are so many needs for competing needs for dollars? Could we do other things better by privatizing rather than have general support?

Mr. Speaker, these are very valid questions, and we have had some extremely creative amendments offered to the Committee on Rules, which they will take under advisement for possibly making in order when this legislation comes to the House floor which I believe could be as early as tomorrow. Many of the amendments get right to the franking privilege. I think it is well understood that there is some abuse there, and I think it is well understood among the constituency that there is some overuse as well. The rules are extremely generous with the use of the frank; that is, free public mailing, and I think that there has been a fair amount of hue and cry across the land to bring that under control.

We have talked about whether or not our legislative service organizations are properly the best use of taxpayers' dollars these days and are those dollars being properly spent at this time when it is something like 20 percent of the funds that have been used for those purposes over the last 10 years and apparently have not been properly accounted for. That does not mean they

have been misspent. It just means they have not been properly accounted for. We do not know exactly what has happened. Mr. Speaker, that is pretty sloppy oversight from a House of Representatives that has two responsibilities. One is legislation, and the other is oversight, and, if we are not getting the oversight done, we are not doing our job, and I do not know who would want to support a legislative appropriations bill that clearly has problems in oversight in the way the moneys are spent. It seems to me that that would be a bill killer if we do not sort that out.

The specialty that I have been working on, as the gentleman from Carolina well knows, is the former Speaker's bill, and we have made a request that that amendment be made in order because the taxpayers are now spending perhaps three-quarters of a million dollars every year to support three former Speakers' public offices, staff of three, office support and franking privileges, and the stated purpose of the law that allows for those moneys to be spent that way was for these former Speakers to be able to administer, settle, and conclude their business as former Speaker.

Now clearly even the most slow-going pace would suggest that that job could be done in a few years, and we are trying to make an amendment so that, instead of perpetuating the former Speakers' activities, we are now terminating them after a decent period of time for wind-down, and we are, thereby, going to save the taxpayers a fair amount of money.

This is somewhat symbolic. What it means is the U.S. Congress is listening to the people out there, saying, "You're right. We are taking better care of ourselves than we are of the people we represent in a number of instances, and we need to stop doing that, and pay attention to the people we work for, and say, 'You're right; we are going to get better use out of precious tax dollars.'"

Mr. Speaker, that is what this process is about in the Committee on Rules. I hope we are able to make that abundance of amendments in order so that these debates will come out of the Committee on Rules and will come out here to the well of the House, the people's House, for all to see, for all to debate, for all to be persuaded to, and for all to listen to and for all to have their input, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for having yielded to me.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for his efforts in this area, and, as he mentioned, the Speakers' dollars we are talking about are three-quarters of a million dollars. Now that is a lot of money to the average taxpayer. It is not a lot in this budget. But it says volumes if we can-

not make this kind of cut, if we cannot show that this expenditure that we are still paying for, a staff of a Speaker who was last here 16 years ago, for instance, that he has not wrapped up his business, and all those Speakers that have served in the past, then how can we ask people in this country to make real major sacrifices if we cannot make that one, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for just an instant, I would point out that of the three former Speakers, two have been retired for a lot longer than they served in the Speaker's chair, and they are, therefore, getting these benefits in a very great disproportion, and one has been retired now for about 8 years, I believe, and served not quite the same amount of time, maybe 10 years, so is coming up on the anniversary date of equalizing.

What all this means, however, is: What are the funds being used for, and the funds are not being used by the former Speakers for the legislative purpose that the funds were set aside for, and the funds are not being used by the former Speakers for the legislative purpose that the funds were set aside for.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. It is difficult to imagine anyone still has legislative business to carry on after 16 years.

Mr. GOSS. That is right.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman has pointed out privately also many times we are not talking about the retirement of these individuals, or health care or other benefits that they get as part of a retirement package. We are talking about staff and the accompaniments of that staff, that sort of cost, not the individual's retirement or personal things.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is absolutely correct. These former Speakers are wonderful, distinguished Members of this institution who have done great service for this Nation, but the legislation is being abused, and it needs to be corrected. That is what the amendment is about.

But I am satisfied that these gentleman are well provided for in terms of their pension benefits, their retirement and their health benefits.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] who has taken an outstanding stand many times for fiscal conservatism and would like to speak on this matter today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for his leadership.

As my colleagues know, one of the frustrating things to me that I have felt keenly for the past several months is we hear speeches by the President

and members of his administration telling us we all need to have shared sacrifice, and I do not necessarily disagree with that ultimately. I think we all, as the American people, are going to have to pull together and do what it takes to put our Republic, once again, on a firm fiscal footing.

I guess what so deeply troubles me is that the rhetoric of shared sacrifice is always directed to the sacrifice of the American taxpayer and never to the sacrifice of the government. The government does not need to sacrifice what those individuals claim. In fact, the role of government is so important that, far from sacrificing, it needs to be augmented, it needs to be expanded, and for that purpose vast new tax increases on the middle class and on everyone are being proposed in order to fund an expanded government.

Mr. Speaker, government needs to go on a diet like most Americans. I suppose we all could benefit from shedding a few pounds, and the government needs to shed a few pounds; that is, a few expenditures it is presently making.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] has taken leadership in trying to have us do just that beginning with the branch that we most are directly associated with, the legislative branch.

I was not here for the beginning of this special order, but I very much join in the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]. I mean it is absurd that we have in essence unlimited funds being provided to three former Speakers of the House to wind up their affairs. This is not to denigrate these men who have served. But if we are going to identify areas where economies can be made, in my opinion this expenditure never should have been made in the first place, but now that we have got it, we should certainly terminate it, and that is just, as my colleagues know, one little area.

The Republican leaders' plan, which I endorse, and this was a plan indicating how the world would be different in terms of running the House of Representatives if the Republicans ever ran it, but that plan calls for a 50-percent reduction in the staffs on the committees. I am very concerned about big government, as I think most Americans are. The bigger the government gets, the more laws and regulations we have to have in order to justify all of its employees. We see this very clearly.

In fact, the gentleman from North Carolina, the sponsor of this special order today, has wisely coauthored a bill which I am very proud to be a cosponsor of that goes directly to the heart of that issue by requiring that, before any administrative regulation proposed by an administrative agency can take effect, it must be actually voted upon here in the Congress of the United States.

□ 1600

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, that would do more than just about any other practical thing we could do to reduce substantially the promotion or the promulgation of new regulations.

We are, after all, the legislative body of the country, created by the Founders and the drafters of the U.S. Constitution. But in practical effect today for years we have been passing very broad laws and leaving the details to someone else, that is, the administrative agencies.

As someone once said, the devil is in the details. It really is. That is where the specifics actually are provided that institute the new burdens on businesses and individuals.

So, you know, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for that effort. As we debate this bill or concept that the gentleman has discussed that would reduce the expenditures of the legislative branch of Government, I think it is very appropriate.

I am convinced we would not only see no reduction in the quality of legislation if we cut these committee staffs by 50 percent, I would represent that the more staff we reduce overall in the House of Representatives, and the Senate, to a certain level, the more we reduce, the better the quality of the legislative product. Because all of a sudden the men and women elected by the people of the United States to come here and serve would give more of their personal attention to these issues. If they cannot read the thousand-page bill, if they cannot be bothered with the details, then there will not be any bill. That is the approach we need to be taking.

We need, as representatives of the people, to be able to digest it, to understand it, and to act upon it, rather than simply just kind of putting it on automatic pilot and letting it go out to the administrative agencies.

The size of this legislative budget and the staff that this budget supports is what makes all of those things possible.

So the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], by proposing these reductions, is not only saving the taxpayers money, which is vital in this time of fiscal crisis, but he is also going to be giving us better government, more effective government, more bang for the buck.

Sure, we want certain things taken care of by government. Well, let us see that they are taken care of. Let us get a healthier economy. Let us increase job opportunities. Let us increase opportunities for people to better themselves financially.

In order to do that, we have to have smaller Government. In order to do that, why, we have to take some of these measures being advocated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

So I am very pleased to be here today and join in this special order, and thank the gentleman for the opportunity.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE]. The gentleman has been a leader in fiscal conservative motions in the past, and I appreciate his efforts today.

Let me just review for a moment for the gentleman and others who may be on the floor that are interested, because the people are often confused with the various bills coming through.

In the first part of the year we debated on this floor a budget bill. The budget is a blueprint. It may be ignored by the appropriating process and it may be ignored by the administration in many cases, although with the majority party being the same party in the White House, it pretty much was in synchronization this time. But it is not the standard that this body goes by.

After we propose a budget and pass a budget as a blueprint we vary from it in great detail.

We have also had a so-called stimulus package that was brought before the Congress where the President asked for \$16 billion of new expenditures, all of it to be added to the deficit. None of it was paid for. This House passed it. I voted against it. I daresay the gentlemen on the floor with me voted against it.

It went to the Senate. It was cut by \$12 billion because it was recognized as pretty much a pork spending piece of legislation to pay off political debts.

But you have had the budget, the so-called stimulus package, and then recently we had the budget package that proposed tax increases and some budget cuts.

As it passed this House and left this House some 2 weeks ago it had something like \$6 of taxes for approximately \$1 in spending cuts. Those spending cuts were set at the very back of the President's term. We have seen that so many times, where we get the taxes retroactive to the first of January when it left this House, and the spending cuts never come.

So we have had the budget proposal that has been debated, which is a blueprint, the so-called stimulus bill, which was \$16 billion of spending with no coverage, which was trimmed to \$4 billion in the Senate, and the tax package, which called for almost \$275 billion in new taxes and something around \$40 or \$50 billion in cuts.

Now we get to the appropriations process. This is really the \$1½ trillion that we appropriate in this country. We do it in a manner with 13 budget bills. We have 13 subcommittees and 13 bills.

The Legislative Branch Subcommittee will be reporting on the floor tomorrow and that will be the first budget bill we will be taking up. That is

why we are here today, to tell the public what is in that legislation now as it has been reported from the committee, to tell you what we think ought to be done and how this bill ought to be amended, and hope that we will get a chance on this floor as Members, many Members, to both debate the amendments we would like to put forward and to have a vote on those amendments for reducing the legislative budget some 25 percent. This would not be across the board, but in selective cuts, and we are talking about those selective cuts today.

Having said that, I would like to recognize a freshman Member of this Congress who has been a leader in the budget cutting process, who just today went before the House Rules Committee arguing for a cut, to cut this legislative branch budget by 25 percent, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICK-
EY].

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when I was campaigning, gosh, it was this time last year, that I saw these shows on television on C-SPAN and I saw the empty seats, and I thought, "Well, I am never going to do that." And now here I am.

But I want to explain to people that, first of all, there are people in the gallery. I am talking to you all, too, because we are all citizens here.

But this thing is that important. What we have as an opportunity tomorrow is going to be monumental as far as the people of America are concerned as it relates to spending cuts.

I get in my office tons and tons of communications on spending cuts first, taxes later. We cannot have a replay of what we had in 1990. There is no reason for us to think that we can tax our way into prosperity. No nation has ever done it. I get that time and time again.

Now, what has come before us in this House, or what might come before us, depending on this rules decision, is the opportunity for us to take leadership in this body among the committees and in our personal office operations to cut expenses by 25 percent.

Now, when you hear that being said, what we are talking about is we take what was last year's expenses and we just knock 25 percent off. We are not doing it all the way across the board, which was my approach at first. But we have kind of gotten a bunch of people together and we are doing it selectively so we are fixing those things that are duplication services and are not necessary, and we are saying zero to those, and others we are keeping at 100 percent.

But the bottom line is 25 percent would be cut from this budget, from the budget of the House of Representatives, for the coming year.

Now, what this means is a certain amount of dollars, and you have heard

people mention that. But more than that it is going to be an element of leadership.

I want to tell a little story from a man in Arkansas about a man named Sam Walton. He built the largest, most successful retail operation in the world on the basis that he did it first, that he did everything that there was. He fixed bicycles, he waited on customers, he put the inventory in his shop, and he learned it. And his employees knew that Mr. Sam would do it if they did not do it.

Now, what we do in this Congress is we sit up here and we say okay, we are going to have some cuts because that is what you all want. But we are going to have it cut from every other area except our own.

We cannot answer the question as to why in the world we are not cutting our own expenses when we face the American people. We can answer it around here when we are talking to colleagues and we are talking this fraternity talk that goes on here, and we can say that is not wise. But when someone says we cannot cut the expenses up here in Congress by 25 percent, ask them why.

□ 1610

They may say, well, it is better that we cut 14 percent, it is better that we cut 5 percent. Ask them, for whom is it better? And that is what we have now.

Mr. Sam's example, do it yourself first and that is leadership. If we are going to have shared sacrifice, let us do it from the top down. And that is what is behind this rules bill that is going to come up.

If we vote on it tomorrow, it is going to be a great day. That is why I take this time here to talk to an empty Chamber, but I know it is not empty out there in America, because you all are crying for us to do what is right.

I want to say, the legislative branch has in its greed increased its spending by 5 percent every year for 15 years. So if we do nothing, we are going to be increasing, because of the appetite that is here. It is like a carnivorous plant. It just keeps growing and building and growing and building. And because of it, we have so many excesses.

Our President, my former Governor and now our President, supports efforts to make "meaningful congressional spending reductions." That is what he says, and I think we can follow that. We need to do this, as I said, so that we can say to the American people, yes, we will sacrifice and, yes, we will give the leadership.

What I am not convinced of is that these people here who are voting against this bill or who might vote against it think there is a life after spending cuts. I cannot imagine what we would do if our Nation operated like we operate here, where we have got this fear or neurosis about spending cuts and what might follow.

So what I am saying is, I am looking forward to the debate tomorrow, if we can have it. If we cannot have the debate, the debate on whether or not the American people will get the 25-percent cut, leadership out of this body, I am hopeful that if we do, you will understand that we are doing it for you, the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). The Chair will note that, being charged with the responsibility of preserving decorum in the debate of this body, the Chair would remind all Members that under the rules and precedents of the House, it is not in order to direct remarks in debate to persons viewing the proceedings in the galleries or on television or even to other Members who, not being present in the Chamber, might be viewing the proceedings on television.

All remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I think they were from the heart, and I think he was speaking from his experience in this body, both now in his time of service and his practical experience before coming here.

One of the things the selective cutting of this body allows us to do, it allows us to keep the funds available for Members who do service in their district. It is only about 20 percent of the dollars in the total congressional budget that go to what could be called a specific congressional service to the public. And we know that need is out there.

We all know that in our congressional offices, we are working every day to help small business people, to help clear up snafus in the bureaucracy.

The dollars that would be available to help those people are still there. We are not cutting other services, like the services for the blind in the congressional Library of Congress, which is under our budget.

We are leaving those funded, 100 percent. We are leaving funded the dollars that are there for the Library of Congress that conducts exchanges with local libraries. In fact, we would like to see in the future us to be able to further transmit the knowledge collected in the Library of Congress out into our local communities so that we can further enrich those communities. These dollars are left in place.

As the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DICKEY], who just spoke, we are, however, making substantial cuts in duplicative services, in numerous committees, in the small fieldoms that are often built up and duplicated around the some 117 subcommittees, the 23 committees, and the 5 joint commit-

tees. And so what we want to do is to work toward modernizing this process, not destroy this process, but making this trimming a budget and leading an example in that way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a former member of the Gang of 7, an outstanding Congressman in this body who has worked toward fiscal responsibility, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR]. I want to thank him for yielding to me and commend him for his efforts on the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations and his effort to cut that budget by some 25 percent.

In the case of myself, I have been to the Committee on Rules just today offering two amendments that I would like to be made in order tomorrow, as we consider the legislative appropriations bill.

The one change that I would like to suggest is with regard to the Architect of the Capitol.

Currently, this body appropriates money for the Architect, who is charged with the responsibility of maintaining the buildings here in the Capitol. Those moneys that are expended to the Architect's Office do not show up in the Clerk of the House Report, do not show up in the Senate reports, and I, as one Member of this body, would like to know how those funds are expended.

So I suggested in my amendment that all of the funds appropriated by the House to the Architect's Office, in fact, show up in the quarterly report from the Clerk.

The second amendment that I have in front of the Committee on Rules that I hope they will make in order tomorrow deals with unsolicited mailings, deals with the congressional frank.

The Congress, this past year, spent \$34 million in free postage for Members to send mail throughout their districts. I believe that this number can continue to be cut, and I expect to support several amendments that will be offered tomorrow to reduce that amount of money.

The fact is that my office, we answered all of the letters we received from our district. We did no mass mailings. We spent about 7.5 percent of our budget or about \$14,000 in 1992 and about \$14,000 in 1991. That is out of a budget of approximately \$170,000. I believe that we can continue to make dramatic progress in reducing the amount of franked mail that goes out of this body.

I think the frank goes back to the first Congress, some 200 years ago, when Members did not have the ability to communicate very well with their constituents. And over these 200 years, our ability as Members of Congress to communicate with our constituents

has increased dramatically, even in the last 10 years, whether it is local newspapers, whether it is cable television, whether it is radio, and I do not think that Congress needs to spend this vast sum of money sending out newsletters and other types of mass mailings.

I would also like to say that I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Ms. Dunn], if it is made in order tomorrow, for a 25 percent cut in committee staffs, both statutory and their investigative staffs.

I think the exponential growth of committee staff here in the Congress has been too much, and it is time that we head in another direction.

As I said earlier, the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], to cut \$10 million in the franking budget, is an amendment, if offered, that I will support.

I think the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], offered with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], to eliminate money for former Speakers, the money that we give to former Speakers to set up and maintain an office, is something that is probably inappropriate.

If I leave here, I get no money to run an office. I do not think former Speakers need that as well.

But I think it has become clear to all of us that have been here, even as short a time as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] and myself, we have been here 2½ years, that the spending spree needs to stop and that we need to get serious about reducing the cost of the Federal Government.

If we are serious about doing that, we need to start those reductions in cost right here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman and appreciate the work he has done.

My colleagues, what we have tried to do with this special order is to alert the Members of the House of the process that we have in the 13 budget bills that will be coming before us. Now is the time for us to make the changes. Now is the time for us to make the cuts.

□ 1620

Having sat in the Committee on Appropriations, I have heard very earnest testimony talking about the needs for diversity in committees, the needs for staffs, even though they may be overlapping in many of the committees, and in many of the expenditures we make, many of the types of services that they offer, perhaps, some special nuance for that expenditure.

I would tell the Members of this body, in my personal experience, I have three boys, 10, 12, and 13. They all wanted a horse. Now, I cannot afford to feed three teenaged boys and three horses, though the horses will eat less.

However, the need can be served in what we have done. We all agreed to buy one old plug and they all take turns riding it, and they named it themselves, each different names. It has worked out fine. They have all learned to ride and they have all gotten a lot of pleasure from it. Some day perhaps we may be able to afford two more horses for them.

We have to do the same in this body. It certainly is nice to have a number of different staffs, committees, organizations that overlap in their services, that give me, maybe, a special viewpoint, or give another Member a certain viewpoint. However, we have come to the time when we cannot afford the luxury of this overlapping and the duplicative services that we have. We cannot afford the growth of government that we have.

We have to, as the first in the 13 budget bills that will be coming before this body and before the Senate and be sent to the President as the legislative budgeting and appropriations process moves forward, we must set the example as the legislative branch of government. We must make the sacrifice if we are to ask others to sacrifice.

I hope tomorrow that the Committee on Rules will allow the amendments necessary for that sacrifice, and time for the debate for the sacrifice to be explained to the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2137

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK) at 9 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2348, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-118) on the resolution (H. Res. 192) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ACT OF 1993

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee plans to meet and grant a rule on the International Relations Act of 1993 on Monday, June 14. A request may be made for a structured rule, which would permit only those floor amendments designated in the rule.

Earlier today, the committee circulated a "Dear Colleague" that requests all amendments to the bill be submitted to the Rules Committee no later than 12 noon on Monday, June 14, 1993.

In order to ensure members' rights to offer amendments under the rule that may be requested, they should submit 55 copies of each amendment together with a brief explanation of each amendment to the committee office at H-312, the Capitol, by 12 noon on Monday, June 14. Members should draft their amendments to the substitute amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 8. Copies of the substitute are available in the offices of Legislative Counsel for the purpose of drafting amendments.

□ 2140

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that the membership is going to understand that if there is a possibility, if they do have amendments and they are prefilled, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules is requesting, that we will have a Committee on Rules meeting on that bill and on their prefilled amendments sometime Monday afternoon, is that correct?

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is what we anticipate, yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. And I would ask further, Mr. Speaker, Members who do have amendments and to prefile them had better be back in town by noon-time or so on Monday in order to testify before the Committee on Rules Monday afternoon?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct, any time between now and Monday noon.

Mr. SOLOMON. I understand that the gentleman may repeat this statement tomorrow when we go in at 10 o'clock so that the membership which has left the Capitol today and tonight will be more aware of it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. I appreciate that very much.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HOEKSTRA (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. QUINN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FAWELL, for 60 minutes, on June 14.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today and on June 10.

Mr. HORN, for 20 minutes each day, on June 15 and 22.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEAL of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. QUINN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. HOEKSTRA.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. COX.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. GOODLING in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEAL of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MURTHA in two instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. TRAFICANT in five instances.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mrs. MEEK.

Mr. TORRES in three instances.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. MENENDEZ in two instances.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. HAYES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. HUTTO.

Mr. MEEHAN.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS in two instances.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting the President's determination (93-24) certifying that substantial withdrawal has occurred of the armed forces of Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, pursuant to Public Law 102-391; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1331. A letter from the Principal Deputy Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on two violations of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1332. A letter from the President, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting a report pursuant to section 21A(k) (9) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1333. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 10-33, "American Geophysical Union Revenue bond Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1334. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Student Assistance General Provisions, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1335. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of deadline date for participation in the Institutional Quality Assurance Program and revision of selection criteria, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1336. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1992 of the Administration on Aging, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3018; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1337. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the Department's efforts to bring about coordination of goals, objectives, and activities of agencies and organizations which

have responsibilities for programs related to child abuse and neglect during 1990, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5106f; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1338. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, transmitting notification of proposed approval of manufacturing license agreement with Israel (Transmittal No. OTC-26-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1339. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1340. A letter from the Manager, Employee Benefits, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Department's annual report on its retirement plan for civilian employees for the year ending September 30, 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1341. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the inspector general's semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1342. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1343. A letter from the Acting Director, Federal Domestic Volunteer Agency, transmitting the two semiannual reports on activities of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1344. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1345. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Service Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Department's inspector general for the period October 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1346. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993, on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1347. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1348. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1349. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the eighth semiannual report of the inspector general for the period

ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1350. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period ended March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1351. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1352. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Department's semiannual report on activities of the inspector general and the semiannual report on final audits for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1353. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the Department's eighth semiannual report on audit followup of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1354. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1355. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1992 section 8 report on national historic and natural landmarks that have been damaged or to which damage to their integrity is anticipated, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1a-5(a); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1356. A letter from the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, transmitting a revised executive summary to the plan of licensing operations of federally documented commercial fishing vessels, along with a joint recommendation from the Coast Guard and the Commercial Fishing Vessel Advisory Committee for implementing the plan, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 7101 note; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1357. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1358. A letter from the Interim CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's April 1993 report on the status of the review required by section 21A(b)(11)(B) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, pursuant to Public Law 101-507, section 519(a) (104 Stat. 1386); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1359. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the third report on the subject of intermarket coordination, pursuant to Public Law 101-432, section 8(a) (104 Stat. 976); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture.

1360. A letter from the Director of Central Intelligence, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Govern-

ment and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Armed Services, the Judiciary, Post Office and Civil Service, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 192. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2348) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-118). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SWETT, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO):

H.R. 2349. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to support the expansion of business executive education programs for owners and managers of disadvantaged small business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. TORRES:
H.R. 2350. A bill to require depository institutions to offer basic financial services accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 2351. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Museum Services Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EWING, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 2352. A bill to make various reforms in the congressional budget process; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. CONYERS:
H.R. 2353. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the summer jobs program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Appropriations and Government Operations.

By Mr. CANADY (for himself and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2354. A bill to limit judicial interference in the management of the Nation's prisons and jails and permit incarceration of greater numbers of dangerous offenders, without restricting the legitimate constitu-

tional rights of inmates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:
H.R. 2355. A bill to require a parent who is delinquent in child support to include his unpaid obligation in gross income, and to allow custodial parents a bad debt deduction for unpaid child support payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LUGO:
H.R. 2356. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to carry out certain construction projects in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas):
H.R. 2357. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to assist the development of small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANTOS:
H.R. 2358. A bill to impose sanctions against any foreign person or U.S. person that assists a foreign country in acquiring a nuclear explosive device or unsafeguarded nuclear material, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2359. A bill to amend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to improve the organization and management of U.S. nuclear export controls, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:
H.R. 2360. A bill to establish the Office of Law Enforcement in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. MEEK:
H.R. 2361. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit amounts in the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund to be used for payments of certain State and local property taxes on forfeited real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 2362. A bill to make a technical correction with respect to the temporary duty suspension for clomiphene citrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. FALLONE):
H.R. 2363. A bill to amend the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act to provide for exceptions in cases of torture, extrajudicial killing, or war crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 2364. A bill to provide employment opportunities to unemployed individuals in high unemployment areas in projects to repair and renovate vitally needed community facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COPPERSMITH (for himself, Mr. KLEIN, and Mr. HOKE):
H.R. 2365. A bill to terminate the Department of Energy's program to promote the use of liquid metal reactors for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURTHA:
H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EWING, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H. Res. 190. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to reform the House, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Rules and House Administration.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 191. Resolution prohibiting Members of the House of Representatives from using the frank for unsolicited mailings; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Post Office and Civil Service, and Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 18: Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 81: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. DANNER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. YATES, and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 349: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.
H.R. 369: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 385: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 538: Mr. MCHALE.
H.R. 569: Mr. MILLER of California.
H.R. 625: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 632: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 643: Mr. KLUG.
H.R. 667: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 749: Mr. WALSH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. FOWLER, and Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 760: Mr. KREIDLER and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 776: Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 789: Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McDADE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DEAL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 790: Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 796: Mr. CARR, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 799: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 823: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. MACHTLEY.
H.R. 961: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. DICKEY.
H.R. 1024: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.
H.R. 1026: Ms. DUNN, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 1036: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1057: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. EWING, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1122: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1126: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1127: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1128: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 1141: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 1164: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 1181: Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. SKAGGS.
H.R. 1188: Mr. WATT and Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 1200: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 1293: Mr. KYL, Mr. COX, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 1314: Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 1349: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 1362: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1453: Mr. FILNER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BYRNE, and Mrs. UNSOELD.
H.R. 1472: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. STUDDS.
H.R. 1490: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 1523: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1543: Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 1552: Mr. PORTER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. DELAULO, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1598: Mr. KOPETSKI.
H.R. 1624: Mr. LEVY.
H.R. 1670: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 1687: Ms. LONG.
H.R. 1697: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MULLOCHAN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. BENTLEY.
H.R. 1707: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 1785: Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 1795: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1796: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1820: Ms. LOWEY and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1821: Ms. LOWEY and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1881: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1900: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1935: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1938: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1957: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 1961: Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SCOTT.
H.R. 1989: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 2017: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MALONEY, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.
H.R. 2113: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 2124: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.
H.R. 2152: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2246: Mr. TEJEDA.
H.R. 2253: Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 2284: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 2292: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2315: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. WALSH.
H.J. Res. 95: Mr. FALCOMAEGA, Mr. VENTO, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.J. Res. 131: Mr. MINETA, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MANN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FALCOMAEGA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.J. Res. 137: Mr. GORDON, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. MARKEY.
H.J. Res. 145: Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. GUNDERSON.
H.J. Res. 167: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.J. Res. 184: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FALCOMAEGA, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. SPENCE.
H.J. Res. 208: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. PAXON.
H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. GALLO.
H. Con. Res. 100: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SWETT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LEACH.
H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 33: Mr. KOPETSKI.
H. Res. 40: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 123: Mr. SOLOMON.
H. Res. 124: Mr. SOLOMON.
H. Res. 148: Mr. INSLEE.
H. Res. 188: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. SAWYER.